

University of Warwick institutional repository: <http://go.warwick.ac.uk/wrap>

A Thesis Submitted for the Degree of PhD at the University of Warwick

<http://go.warwick.ac.uk/wrap/56107>

This thesis is made available online and is protected by original copyright.

Please scroll down to view the document itself.

Please refer to the repository record for this item for information to help you to cite it. Our policy information is available from the repository home page.

ROLE (RE)CONSIDERED

**A re-evaluation of the relationship between
teacher-in-role and acting**

By

Judith Ackroyd-Pilkington

A thesis submitted in fulfilment for the PhD

**University of Warwick
Arts Education
January 2002**

CONTENTS

Introduction

- setting the scene	7
- rehearsing re-considerations	11
- the context of the piece	13
- thesis structure	17

Section One: Exposition

Methodological Approach

- Research Considerations	23
- choosing case study	26
- issues of data analysis	28
- Research Method	35
1. Theoretical Research	
2. Fieldwork: Research of Practice	37
- selection of case studies	37
- preparing for case studies	40
- preparing for observation	41
- preparing for interviews	44
- the fieldwork process	46
3. Testing the hypothesis	47
4. Presenting the data	48

Section Two: Rising Action

Destabalising Distinctions and Definitions

- introduction	50
- definitions	57
- contexts & audience relationships	86
- functions and aims	95
- skills	117
- approaches	130
- assumptions	150

Section Three: Climax

Case Studies

- introduction to case studies 160
- Cecily O’Neill
 - introduction to Cecily O’Neill 166
 - context of observation 167
 - narrative account of session 167
 - semiotic analysis of the session 170
 - the interview 174
 - analysis of interview 178
 - contextualising the case study 181
- John O’Toole
 - introduction to John O’Toole 195
 - context of observation 196
 - narrative account of session 197
 - semiotic analysis of the session 200
 - the interview 204
 - analysis of interview 209
 - contextualising the case study 212
- Fiona Shaw
 - introduction to Fiona Shaw 226
 - context of observation 231
 - play outline 231
 - semiotic analysis of the session 232
 - the interview 235
 - analysis of interview 240
 - contextualising the case study 244

Section Four: Denouement

Conclusion

- summary 257
- this research reveals 259
- this research suggests 260
- the significance of the research 261

Bibliography 264

Appendices 281

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I am indebted to

David Booth, Simon Callow, Cecily O'Neill, Fiona Shaw, and John O'Toole

for giving me time and support while I was preparing the case studies. They have my thanks and my continued respect for their work and contributions to drama.

Special thanks to

Joe Winston

who took me on during my last year of study, was unstinting with his time and commitment to my case, and made it all worthwhile.

This thesis is dedicated to

Andrew Pilkington

Definitions – and thinking about definitions – are valuable and essential, but they must never be made into absolutes; if they are, they become obstacles to the organic development of new forms, experiment and invention. It is precisely because an activity like drama has fluid delimitations that it can continuously renew itself from sources that had hitherto been regarded as lying beyond its limits.

(Esslin, 1978, p. 11)

DECLARATION

I declare that this thesis is all my own work and has not been submitted for a degree at another university.

WORD COUNT

72,000

ABSTRACT

This thesis examines the under-researched area of teacher-in-role. It seeks to determine whether or not teachers working in role are acting and suggests that contrary to the orthodox position, a strict distinction between teacher-in-role and acting can no longer be sustained.

This thesis will argue that, within the discourse of drama in education, the concept of acting is narrow due to both a restricted view of theatre and an assumption that there is an inherent contradiction between acting and a pedagogic function. By examining theories of acting, I will suggest that definitions within the dramatic art form should be temporary to accommodate diverse and developing practices.

The theoretical research focuses on four relevant aspects of acting and role -context and the relationship with audience, functions and aims, skills, and approaches - which are then applied to samples of practice in the case studies. I then present two case studies of drama education practitioners and one of an actor, drawing comparisons between them in terms of practice and discourse. The practice of each case study subject is also examined through a semiotic framework of analysis; and the assumptions emerging from the interviews, and their implications, are interrogated in the light of the earlier theoretical research presented in an earlier section.

INTRODUCTION

In the spring of 1998 I delivered a paper with Andrew Pilkington, a sociologist, at an international drama conference in Cork. I worked as a teacher-in-role in our presentation to provide the context for our research. Immediately after the paper, a drama education practitioner noted that I was clearly a teacher working in role, and not an actor, giving as an example the way I had dealt with some late arrivals. Later that day an actor approached me saying that it was interesting to see another actor at the conference.

This struck me powerfully as I had, from my initial training, been taught that working in role as a teacher was not the same as acting. I was left wondering what it is that we do as teachers in role. Am I an actor when I work in role? Is role-taking different from acting? What does taking on role actually involve? Does it matter whether I am acting or not?

This thesis is my journey to find out.

Setting the scene

In 'Richard 11', I'm standing there, facing the audience, saying, 'I'm pretending to be Richard 11, and you're going to pretend that I'm Richard 11, okay? That's what we're going to play. So I'm starting now!' (Shaw, cited in Zucker, 1999)

I find this fascinating as it is very reminiscent of my early teacher roles with classes I did not know, or with whom I did not feel secure. 'Please accept me in this role. Please speak to me

as if I am a traffic warden!’ ‘Don’t tell me that space travellers don’t wear skirts and beads!’

Fiona Shaw was anxious because it was the first time she had played a male role, and it was a king, and it was the National Theatre. I was anxious because the drama in my classroom would not progress if the children refused to pretend with me.

The actor and audience give mutual consent to sharing in a pretend. No one needs to believe that Fiona Shaw is King Richard, nor I the space traveller. They just have to agree that Shaw speaks as if she is Richard and I speak as if I am the space traveller.

Just as Shaw felt that Deborah Warner’s experimental production involved a risk element, I have been one of those teachers Fleming talks about who has ‘been faced by pupils who fail to take their efforts seriously, [and can] attest to the fact that the technique [of teacher working in role] is not without its risks’ (1997).

Four years ago I would never have dreamed of constructing such a comparison. What I did in role in the classroom bore no relation to what an actor did on the stage. Yet, the experience at Cork made me think that it was time to look more closely.

One of the favourite dramas that I teach with Key Stage 2 children has involved a time tunnel structure for exploring historical issues. The drama is used to explore events such as the Roman attack on Anglesey in AD 60 (Appendix 1). Through the time tunnel the children see different perspectives and learn about the beliefs and fighting methods of the Romans and the Britons (Ackroyd & Boulton, 2001). The drama requires the teacher to take various roles in order to provide information when the children ask for it. I recall a boy explaining why he

liked the drama: 'It were all the costumes and that'. This intrigued me because I had not used any costumes. I had been the young Roman soldier, the time traveller and an old Druid, wearing the same skirt and top throughout! Vincent's 'and that' may have meant props. I had used none. Mulling over the remark, I realised that in the role I had adopted as Marcus, the young soldier, I had 'shown off' my helmet and had dropped my head to put it on, and then stood high when I pretended to have the helmet on. I had commented on how tall it was to frighten the enemy, and had pointed to the strips of metal stretching down my cheekbones and over the nape of my neck. I had indicated with words and movements that it was rather heavy. Here, I was doing nothing new. Creating pictures in the mind of what cannot actually be produced, for whatever reason, is a device used throughout theatre history. The poets of ancient Greece used vivid description to describe violent acts that were not shown on stage. Listening to, or even reading, the messenger's description of Pentheus' demise up on the mountains in *The Bacchae* is an experience of words painting pictures. I have a very clear picture in my mind of the tree bowed, and the limbs strewn.

One of Shakespeare's great strengths as a writer is the effectiveness of his imagery, his use of descriptions and figures of speech that appeal to the senses. On a bare stage, without even a curtain to signal a change of scene, playwrights had to use words in place of scenery. Through language Shakespeare provides the audience with significant clues about the setting, as in Romeo's description of the sunrise that forces him to leave Juliet after their wedding night. (Andrews, 2001, Vol. 2, p.15).

In the classroom we use language to describe settings, costumes and imaginary items as in the Roman example. Presumably, it was my role as Marcus that made Vincent say he had

liked the costumes. So Vincent was doing nothing more than many members of an audience have done before. He was hearing words and watching action and creating mental pictures of what was being constructed through language supported by appropriate gestures.

Perhaps the notion of transformation, prevalent in many forms of theatre, is helpful here, because it takes us a step further, to the idea of a shift in what we perceive to be physically presented before us. Mike Alfreds highlights the duality of actor and role that is maintained during such transformations.

In theatre the actor transformed himself in the presence of his audience who experienced his transformation simultaneously with the actor. The actor said, in effect, "I am both me, here, now and someone else in some other place and time". So, the exciting possibility was to combine the fact of the actor's transformation and the fact of the audience's awareness. The audience had to be made aware of this duality. Through it, the two groups of people shared in an act of imagination - were in fact, brought together by it. This duality is, for me, the essence of theatre, the nature of its uniqueness. (1980, p.4).

I transformed myself in the presence of the children who experienced the transformation simultaneously with me, just as Alfreds describes. It was the children's awareness of this duality that enabled them to participate. They, too, could be themselves whilst, at the same time, speaking as someone else in the drama. We 'shared in an act of imagination'.

Callow believes that transformation for the actor involves a physical change. The body, face, voice and mannerisms are different when an actor transforms himself into a character. This

he distinguishes from a kind of acting where the actor chooses to maintain her own voice and walk, for example. (2000, Interview. Appendix 2). This type of acting in which no physical transformation takes place might suggest that the duality of actor and role is more obvious. If there is no physical transformation, the role may be more transparent, revealing the actor behind it. In this drama, I wore my own clothes, and given the multiplicity of my roles, may not so easily have been associated with one particular role. I didn't really change my voice though I spoke in different language registers, appropriate to the different roles and the imagined contexts. I had not transformed according to Callow's definition, yet I had assumed a shared understanding of transformation in Alfred's terms.

Vincent may have chosen to ignore this duality because he enjoyed believing I was wearing other clothes and being someone else. But I remain uncertain whether he took a choice to pretend with me, as Fiona Shaw wished her audience to do, or whether he was genuinely unclear about the distinction between teacher and role. Just as I am uncertain about Vincent's experience, I am uncertain about mine. Ten years on, the vividness of the memory of that class in a Northampton school has not changed. What has changed are my thoughts about exactly what I was doing.

Rehearsing re-considerations

The title of this thesis, 'Role (Re) Considered', through its reference to Philip Zarrilli's edited book on acting, self-consciously invites a connection to be made between the field of drama education and the world of performance. It is this connection which is at the heart of my journey. To discover if teacher-in-role is acting, I had to explore notions of acting and performance. Zarrilli's collection of essays in *Acting (Re) Considered* (1996) is written from

many different perspectives and raises issues that are relevant to a (re)consideration of teacher-in-role. In his introduction, the first point Zarrilli draws our attention to is the rift between theorists and practitioners:

There are many languages and discourses of acting, each written/spoken from a particular point of view. Theorists often speak only to theorists; practitioners only to practitioners. Too seldom do they speak to each other and to those parts of our 'selves' which might practice theory or theorize practice. (1996, p.1)

The same has not really been the case in the field of drama in education. It has continued to develop its theory alongside its practice. Those who have influenced theory have usually influenced practice, such as Booth, O'Neill, O'Toole and Neelands. At the same time, these practitioners who have influenced practice have usually influenced theory, too. However, a particular communication gap in the field of drama education emerges, as there seems to have been very little talking between teachers and actors. I propose that in the field of drama education a series of assumptions have been made about acting behaviour, but a richer understanding of acting processes has rarely been sought through connecting with actors. As Zarrilli seeks to bridge a gap, so this thesis will address a gap I perceive in the field.

Zarrilli 'invites the reader to (re)consider both acting and discourses on acting.' This thesis will do the same, alongside a more detailed (re)consideration of teacher role and discourses on teacher role. He uses '(re)consider' to mark clearly the implicitly processual nature of "considering" (1996, p.1). It is this explicit expression of process that I wish to draw into a reconsideration of the teacher-in-role. Following Zarrilli, I propose that we can acknowledge

only temporary understandings since the processes do not stop, and theatre and drama emerge and re-emerge, shifting and reforming. Our understandings of theatre do not stand still. There are two major explanations for this. Firstly, the object for consideration keeps changing: performance experiments are constantly underway, new styles develop and conventions are continually broken. Secondly, our way of looking at theatre and performance continually changes, partly due to the changes mentioned above, but also as new theoretical perspectives are applied to the field. In the light of such constant changes, I wish to echo Zarrilli's sense of process, but in the field of drama education. There is a rich body of literature and practice continues to evolve. Any proposals that may be articulated in this thesis are modestly made as temporary understandings, subject to the same evolution of ideas and practices as theatre. *Acting (Re)Considered* identifies theatre-making as 'a socio-cultural practice'. As such it is not 'an innocent or naive activity separate from or above and beyond everyday reality, history, politics, or economics' (p.1). This is as relevant to theatre making in the classroom as it is to professional theatre. In this thesis I take it as a given that the improvisational event cannot be isolated from the particular drama form, its time, place and context.

The context of the piece

Arguably, one of the strengths of the field of drama in education continues to be its capacity and willingness to re-evaluate its practices and investigate and reposition theoretical assertions. Historically there are many examples of this. Since 'Slade burst on to the scene at the Bonnington conference in 1948 with the claim that child drama is different to theatre'

(Davis, 1998, p. xi)¹ the relationship between theatre and drama in education has been often reconsidered. By 1980 Ken Robinson described Dorothy Heathcote as seeing no 'dichotomy between theatre and drama activities in education.' (p.3) In *Structuring Drama Work* (1990) Jonathan Neelands used the terms *theatre* and *drama* synonymously, and five years later Cecily O'Neill described process drama as a *theatre event* (1995). Fleming in 1997 explained that 'Publications on drama now largely take it for granted that the dichotomies between "process" and "product"; "theatre" and "drama"; "drama for understanding" and "drama as art"; "experience" and "performance" were false dichotomies' and goes on to summarise some of the reasons for the new consensus (pp.1-2).²

Gavin Bolton's *Acting in Classroom Drama* (1998), a more recent example, is a scholarly look at widely held views and leads to a call for a broader perspective on what it is that children are doing in classroom drama. He searches '*for a generic unity between what has been central to his teaching, the value of dramatic playing...and other forms of acting behaviour*' (Davis, 1998, p.x). Bolton's purpose in the book is to

give the term "acting" serious consideration...[He uses] drama exponents' implicit or explicit perceptions of acting behaviour as a basis for a revised conceptual framework. This reformulation attempts to make a case for embracing, in the classroom, many different kinds of acting behaviour as a basis that go beyond the limits and responsibilities of a stage actor,

¹ I do not intend to consider the various terms - nor their implications - for drama activity in the classroom, such as drama education, experiential drama or process drama. In this thesis the term 'drama in education' will be used consistently.

² For a straightforward description of the rifts and shifts over the role of teacher, and the drama process and product, see Kitson & Spiby, 1997

while nevertheless including both “stage” acting and that kind of acting behaviour associated with “teacher-in-role” led drama (Bolton, 1998, p.xvii).

But there is a lacuna here. Bolton in his reconsideration has not reconsidered the role of the teacher. Nor, indeed, has anyone else. If we have an understanding of the teacher taking part in the drama with the children (who are acting), why isn't she acting, too?

In this thesis I want to investigate the teacher-in-role and see if that, too, cannot be included in what Bolton calls *acting behaviour*. Is the teacher-in-role acting? If not, what is she doing? If she is acting, what sort of acting is it? With which acting traditions can it be identified? I too, wish to use ‘drama exponents’ implicit or explicit perceptions of acting behaviour as a basis for a revised conceptual framework’. It may engage us in a broadening of our concept of acting and it may also engage us in a wider notion of teacher-in-role. The desire to broaden concepts of acting is central to Zarrilli’s volume. He:

invites students of acting, actors, and theorists alike to put aside parochial preconceptions and points of view that propose acting as a truth (that is, one system, discourse, or practice). (He) invites instead a pro-active, processual approach which cultivates a critical awareness of acting as multiple and always changing. (1996, p.3)

If ‘acting’ covers such a huge range of activities, I wish to consider whether the teacher-in-role might be appropriately included among them. Given the contemporary climate of re-evaluation, the commitment to inclusivity, and the opening up of concepts, features commonly identified with postmodernism (Denzin,1991) and post colonialism, (Williams

and Chrisman, 1993), it is time for the field of drama in education to (re) consider its assumptions about the activity we call teacher-in-role.

Back drop

I was introduced to the practice of teacher-in-role during my postgraduate teacher training course with David Davis at the University of Central England in Birmingham. It was taught as a crucial pedagogical strategy for the drama teacher. All the student teachers used it in their practice. My dissertation, entitled ‘Teacher-in-role: Tool or Technique?’ took it as its focus. Drama had been a subsidiary subject in my first degree and I had had some experience of acting, but I embraced teacher-in-role as something very different. I thoroughly enjoyed working in role and was convinced of its efficacy, so that some years later when I joined an advisory service I readily introduced teachers to the practice.

During those years and more recently when training teachers, I continued to argue that working in role was not the same as acting. This was made explicit in all the drama education literature, as we shall see. It has been the dominant view among theorists and practitioners alike. It was not just that this would make the task less daunting for teachers or students who had not studied drama, I did firmly believe that the two were distinctly different. However, other parts of my teaching seem to have assumed a very close relationship between acting and teacher role. Whilst saying it was different on the one hand, I was on the other hand teaching students how to draw on their understanding of kinetics and proxemics when taking roles. Familiarity with *Theatre as a Sign System* (Aston & Savona, 1991) and Pavis’ questionnaire (1985, p. 208-12) were compulsory. The education students were obliged to video themselves teaching to enable them to analyse their drama lessons in relation to a host

of criteria, but particularly to see how they signed in role to the children in role. Were they giving cross messages through words and body language? Were the gestures too big so that they inhibited the children's participation? Did the role provide an appropriate model for the children to follow? Was the integrity of the role apparent?

About four years ago my teaching commitment at work changed from teacher training courses to drama courses. I now work in the drama department of a division of performance studies. Looking back, this change coincided with my re-think about the activity of teacher-in-role. Our drama students are required to consider the semiotic aspects of performances and we expect them to understand how communication is made through signing systems that include tone of voice and gesture. I am left wondering if the questions I asked the education students about how they signed in role were significantly different from the questions I now ask drama students about an actor's performance.

Thesis structure: a theatrical analogy

The structure of this thesis follows the structure of the well-made play, the familiar four-stage model of western theatre (Archer, 1912). The scene is first set. Tension then builds up towards a critical point before resolution is provided. The thesis is intended to take the reader, as the play takes the audience, through this dramatic process. Initially, the context of this issue-based encounter is established and characters are introduced. In the second stage tension is built up as various theoretical analyses problematise the established view. The possible consequences for the status quo are introduced and anticipated. The peak of interest is hopefully reached when the theoretical explorations come into close contact with practical

examples. Finally, the implications of the earlier stages are considered and brought into a frame for considering the outcome for the future.

This analogy can be examined more closely. The four stages of the well-made play are quite specific:

1. Exposition

The main characters of the drama together with the basic situation are revealed. The problem with which the drama will be concerned is outlined.

2 Rising Action

The events of the drama occur, each one building in intensity. The characters in the drama struggle with the problem and experience a series of set-backs, not so difficult as to make them give up but not so easy that they can be overcome without exertion.

3. Climax or crisis

The high point of the drama where struggle is at its most intense. The status quo is changed.

4. Resolution or denouement

The drama is rounded off, the problem is resolved, the outcome ascertained and the subsequent fate of the characters decided. (Kitson & Spiby, 1997, p.80)

Exposition

The main characters of the drama together with the basic situation are revealed. The problem with which the drama will be concerned is outlined. (ibid.)

The main characters to feature in this thesis, the case study subjects, are revealed in the Methodological Approach. The basic situation of the research is detailed. The hypothesis is presented and the difficulties inherent in verifying that hypothesis effectively are examined. The approach selected to carry out the research project is explained and discussed.

Rising action

The events of the drama occur, each one building in intensity. The characters in the drama struggle with the problem and experience a series of set-backs, not so difficult as to make them give up but not so easy that they can be overcome without exertion. (ibid.)

In order to prepare for the case studies I needed to establish theoretical frameworks through which to examine practice. As the new information is introduced, the complexities of the research questions are increased. The difficulties the researcher faces in answering the research questions are 'not too great to be attempted, and yet not so easy that they can be overcome without a struggle'. The struggle is what maintains the interest in the research endeavour.

It was crucial to examine what has been written about teacher-in-role and its practice. To which roles in the theatre had it been associated? How have teachers been advised to prepare for it, and what skills are required to fulfil it? The second chapter of this thesis provides an in-depth analysis of what I found in the literature of drama in education about the practice of teacher-in-role. This examination of the literature is accompanied by reference to theorists in the field of theatre and performance in order to begin the process of bridging the gap between the two fields in relation to acting

Inevitably, looking at what has been written about role and acting leads to problems with regard to definitions and implications. What one theorist writes about acting may imply a different definition from that of another theorist. We are aware of the destabilisation of language, the slippery nature of definitions, and that so-called shared views are not necessarily shared. In Lyotard's view, the 'truth claims' and assumed consensus of universal history are now untenable. (Selden & Widdowson, 1993, p.184) He argues that the 'grand narrative has lost its credibility', (Lyotard, 1984) and identifies as part of postmodernism a destabilising of assumptions and a 'relentless critique of the legitimacy of *any* form of social or ideological meaning' (Easthope & McGowan, 1992, p.183). Lyotard's position is that narratives have failed to provide a total and unifying understanding of the world (Fortier, 1997). Vattimo's argument is that postmodern thinking involves provisional thought; ongoing thought that exists without the backing of any foundation of truth (Vattimo, 1988). Here we can identify the spirit of Zarrilli's collection. Terms are unstable and assumptions loaded. With no certainties remaining in our postmodern culture, we can only look to temporary conceptualisations.

Given that postmodernism is frequently identified with a 'generalised pessimism about the possibility of social change' (Fortier, 1997, p.120), let us pick up on Lyotard's identification of a positive advantage in the postmodern commitment to critiquing the legitimacy of assumptions. Communities have built up their own histories and sets of assumptions, and have mutually supported these narratives. There are examples in the field, or 'community' of drama education that are significant to this study. One of the first surprising discoveries in this research project, for example, was that while voices within drama in education make

sharp distinctions between role and acting, performance theorists do not. So much had I assimilated as a drama practitioner that I had taken this distinction as a 'truth claim' and had not, for nearly twenty years, challenged it. This is the context in which I present Section Two where I will approach the problems of definitions, language and assumptions across the gap between teachers and actors. I will also examine the difficulty of common terms within the field and consider definitions offered, whilst examining arguments in support of the tentative and temporary nature of such definitions.

Climax

The high point of the drama where struggle is at its most intense. The status quo is changed.

(Kitson & Spiby, 1997, p.80)

The thesis has been building up to the case studies. Theoretical analysis has shaped a framework with which to examine the practice of the case study subjects. The consensus view and alternative positions have been identified and now the struggle to understand teacher-in-role is most intense as theory and practice are brought together.

The literature review and exploration of terms have prepared for the close scrutiny required in Section Three. Examples of the work of two drama education practitioners and an actor are examined, and extracts of recorded interviews are provided. In the light of the theoretical explorations of Section Two, the examples of practice and interview texts are deconstructed in order to open up the underlying impressions, assumptions and convictions of the case study subjects. It is after the third case study of an actor, that direct comparisons can be made between the examples of teacher-in-role and acting to which the thesis has been leading.

Denouement

The drama is rounded off, the problem is resolved, the outcome ascertained and the subsequent fate of the characters decided. (ibid.)

Finally, in the well-made play the ends must be tied up. Some attempt at closure is required through answers to implicit and explicit questions such as,

Is the teacher-in-role acting?

Why does it matter whether teacher-in-role is acting or doing something else?

If we call it acting, how might this affect our practice?

But ends are not always tied inevitably and irrevocably, even in plays following this structure. Some questions are left unanswered. Ibsen's Nora Helmer slams that famous door, but we are left without knowing what will become of her. (Ibsen, 1980) William Archer makes the point that many plays do not have a clear conclusion, 'We have seen a good many plays of late which do not end, but simply leave off : at their head we might perhaps place Ibsen's *Ghosts*' (1912). In the absence of clear endings, we create a range of continuations to the narrative in our minds. Futures are not certain or fixed.

Similarly, this thesis will not present any final certainties but propose a new perspective for viewing the teacher-in-role that will hopefully open up new dialogues, draw upon acting practices to further the exploration of teacher-in-role and suggest possibilities for further associated research.

SECTION ONE: EXPOSITION

METHODOLOGICAL APPROACH

RESEARCH CONSIDERATIONS

My research question may be expressed as ‘Can teacher-in-role be described as acting?’ Having established a clear research question, I initially thought that selecting a research methodology would be quite simple. However, I quickly discovered that ‘the practice of research is a messy and untidy business which rarely conforms to the models set down in methodological textbooks’ (Brennan, 1992, p.3). Whilst at first this was frustrating, in time, Brennan’s observation became very liberating. It gave me the justification to look at the experiences and strategies of other researchers and then construct my own model that would suit the particularity of my study.

Another optimistic expectation was also soon dashed. I had supposed that once I had identified an appropriate research model, I could follow the approaches associated with that style. But messiness thrives here, too. There is no simple way for the researcher, no short cut; an approach must be selected with an awareness of its strengths and weaknesses, that is appropriate for the given research task. From here, methods of data collection must be selected according to ‘the nature of the inquiry and the type of information required’ (Bell, 1999, p.8), which may not be only those associated with one chosen approach. In this section I will look at my choices of research model, research approach, and methods of data

collection, considering the reasons for and the implications of my choices, and interrogating my quest for validity.

The literature dealing with methodological issues typically distinguishes two contrasting traditions in relation to the empirical investigation of social and educational phenomena. These are characterised by Cohen and Manion as ‘the normative and interpretative paradigms’ (Cohen & Manion, 1994, p.36) and are distinguished by different ontological, epistemological and methodological assumptions. They have become in turn associated with distinct methods and techniques which I will consider below. ‘Normative’ models seek to discover generalisations and causations and are not surprisingly associated with scientific research. There is a search for general laws, causal mechanisms and therefore the prediction of outcomes. Elsewhere it is called the scientific research paradigm or ‘the (neo-) positivist educational research paradigm’ (Ernest, 1994, p.22). In contrast, the ‘interpretative’ or ‘naturalistic’ approach has grown from methods developed in the field of sociology and ‘is concerned with human understanding, interpretation, intersubjectivity, lived truth (i.e. in human terms).’ (ibid. p.24). The normative and interpretative paradigms are associated with quantitative and qualitative research respectively, though neither excludes any particular method. Bell clarifies the distinctions between the two:

Quantitative researchers collect facts and study the relationship of one set of facts to another. They use techniques that are likely to produce quantified and, if possible, generalizable conclusions. Researchers adopting a qualitative perspective are more concerned to understand individuals’ perceptions of the world. They doubt whether social

'facts' exist and question whether a 'scientific' approach can be used when dealing with human beings. Yet there are occasions when qualitative researchers draw on quantitative techniques, and vice versa. (Bell, 1999, pp.7-8)

Given the nature of my research question, this research project is firmly located within an interpretative paradigm. According to this paradigm, what distinguishes human beings is that they attribute meaning to the social world. Human beings do not merely respond to stimuli but engage in meaningful behaviour. In view of this, it is argued that 'we can only understand human behaviour by ensuring that our methods of research...document the ways in which the meanings of relationships (and other phenomena) are constructed and sustained' (Holdaway, 2000, p.165). As if an endeavour to understand human behaviour wasn't complex enough, my research concerns the way that humans construct and sustain *fictional* relationships, rather than 'actual' relationships. The additional complexities arising from my research project, however, do not affect the appropriateness of the interpretative model for my research plan. The use of an interpretive research paradigm tends to encourage the use of a qualitative approach, as we have seen, given the concern 'to document adequately the richness and diversity of meanings people attribute to phenomena' (Holdaway, 2000, p.166). But even here, there are choices to be made for 'Qualitative research, as a set of interpretive practices, privileges no single methodology over any other ... Nor does qualitative research have a distinct set of methods that are entirely its own' (Denzin and Lincoln, 1994, p.3). There are different methods available to the qualitative researcher, and the choice of specific techniques of investigation needs to be based on the nature of the problem under investigation.

Choosing case study

I opted for case study ‘to concentrate on a specific instance or situation and to identify, or attempt to identify, the various interactive processes at work’ (Bell, 1999, p.11). My ‘specific instances’ would be professionals working at a particular time in a particular context observed by me, the researcher. I sought to understand the interactive processes involved in those working instances to enable me to make meaningful comparisons. I initially intended to complete six case studies incorporating three teachers and three actors. However, as the work progresses, I decided that a more thorough, analytical approach to the theoretical groundwork for the case studies in Section Two would benefit the study as a whole, as would a detailed, closer analysis of material from fewer case studies. Consequently, although I had completed observations and interviews with three teachers and two actors, I decided to include two teachers and one actor in the final draft, using the other material indirectly, to enrich reflection. Case study facilitates an in-depth analysis, ‘to explore in all its richness a particular which can serve as a paradigm or exemplar, illustrative of something more general.’ (Ernest, 1994, p.25) A case study documents what is unique to the particular instance, and yet this particular instance ‘is intended to illustrate the general’ (ibid.). Case studies enable comparisons to be made between the perceptions and practices of two different groups of individuals, and judgments to be made about the processes they are engaging in and the similarities and distinctions at play. The two groups in the context of my research project are teachers using Teacher-in-role, and an actor. By studying each group closely, I sought to identify the unique aspects of the individuals involved, but also hoped to illuminate any commonalities. I aimed to understand:

- how the teachers use role in their own distinctive ways;
- what similarities exist in their use of role;
- the features of the actor's work;
- what actors and teachers do in common;
- what is unique about the practice of both groups.

Having identified the interpretative paradigm as the most appropriate for my research project, and then opted for case study, I still had many decisions to make. Case study is not a method, but 'an umbrella term for a family of research methods having in common the decision to focus on inquiry around an instance' (Adelman et al. 1977, p.139). The particular methods for gathering information to construct the case studies needed to be addressed, and data collecting instruments designed. To make these decisions I had to return again to the particular context and aims of my project as they could only be made according to what is appropriate for this specific research.

Firstly, I knew that I wanted to talk to the case study subjects. This would give me information about the thinking behind the processes at play. But even at this basic starting point, there are problems. There is the problem of me, the interviewer. Bias may creep into the way I frame questions, and I may have a particular effect on the way the subject responds because 'interviewers are human beings and not machines' (Selltiz et al, 1962, p.583). I was also aware of wanting particular information from the interview and understood why Wiseman and Aron (1972) have likened interviewing to fishing. Secondly, there were the problems associated with interviewing subjects from different fields of activity and expecting

to be able to draw comparisons. Those in each professional group may describe their work differently from one another. They would draw upon their own discourses and might have personal, professional and/or historical reasons for identifying their work in a particular way. Given the fact that I knew the teachers, but not the actor, there was inevitably a difference between the ways the interviews would be on a 'continuum of formality' (Grebenik and Moser, 1962, p.62). It became clear that speaking to the case study subjects would give me some useful information, but wouldn't be enough. I determined to observe the case study subjects, too, since then I could endeavour to maintain a parity that may not be present through the conversations. Furthermore, I could then relate their practices to their own theories of practice, as related to me in the interviews.

Issues of data analysis

Here, of course, lay a further potential cause for concern. *I* would be analysing the research data collected. I would be interpreting what *I* had seen and heard, yet we know that 'interpretations are narrative, or storied accounts' (Denzin and Lincoln, 1994, p.481). Personal interpretations may privilege any number of different positions, and specific contexts and even moods could influence my responses. Yet, my interpretations would not be monitored. This research project is seeking an answer to a particular question, and I have declared my view that it is time to reassess our notions of teacher-in-role and acting behaviour. Inevitably, some may choose to level criticism at this as a research approach, suggesting that researchers cannot make sound judgments if they approach the research with a particular view of the issue before they even begin the project. Those from a normative position claim that it is possible to avoid subjective interpretations and identify facts through

systematic quantitative means. It is no wonder that they are critical of an individual's interpretation of events as a valid way of furthering human knowledge and understanding.

But let us turn to the other position, to those who are not convinced that there are absolute truths or facts that can be extrapolated from human interactions; who maintain a view that the study of human behaviour requires a distinctly different mode of research; who see researcher interpretation as an inevitable and justifiable part of the research process. The arguments for the interpretative position have articulated these views. Denzin and Lincoln, for example, argue that 'writers interpret as they write, so writing is a form of inquiry' (1994, p.481). More recent literature invites us 'to explore the consequences of our own subjectivity: to accept that knowledge is socially situated and to take responsibility for our own position in relation to those about whom we write' (Jackson, 2000, p.55). Indeed, for some writers, 'reflexive autobiographical accounts' are invaluable not least because they enable us better 'to assess the validity, reliability and generalisability of ... particular research' (Walford, 1991, p.5). Research is not merely a technical activity, but is also a social activity with ethical implications, and our positionality and biases do make a difference to the process and the outcome of research.

Much of the defence of the interpretative and autobiographical approaches is established through the deconstruction of the positivist approach. The critics who are sceptical about interpretative research generally assume that there is a more objective alternative. However, Polanyi argued that even scientific knowledge is not purely objective, but that it is actually highly personal (1962). He suggests that many tacit assumptions lie behind what scientists

describe. Challenges to the scientific model have persisted. Winston claims that ‘the distinction between subjective and objective observations is a false dichotomy’ (1998, p.88). He argues that ‘there is a tendency within positivist research design to conflate objectivity with measurement and to equate both with Truth; to view objectivity as impersonal and subjectivity as *only* personal’ (Winston, 1998, p.88). Winston points out that positivist research designs have generated flawed results and cannot therefore be deemed perfect models. (ibid. p.88) He draws our attention to Guba and Lincoln who claim that research designs ‘are all inventions of the human mind and hence subject to human error. No construction is or can be incontrovertibly right.’ (cited in Taylor, 1996, p.18).

There are those who are actively against normative research in the field of drama in education. Rasmussen, who has called for the development of a philosophy of drama research (1996, pp.129-30) is critical of Wagner’s admission ‘that most effective studies emerge from ‘a positivist rather than a constructivist ontology, and that we find ourselves citing empirical research as a rhetorical ploy.’ He argues for us to ‘avoid such powerless rhetorical play and present sound alternatives to insist on a humanistic, aesthetic drama discipline.’ (Rasmussen, 1999, p.277). The temptation for researchers in the arts to use scientific models in their attempt to prove the value of the arts in a way that will convince those in positions of power has been a well-documented concern (see also Winston, 1998). A post-positivist view has emerged that accepts that there is no clear, neat approach that can provide researchers with an absolute answer to their questions. Hence, interpretative models need not be seen as producers of biased research, but as a different approach to research, intended to render different types of findings.

In relating these issues to my project, I welcomed the opportunity to declare my positionality and to acknowledge my place in the research process. Sikes explains:

I want to acknowledge my experiences by saying 'instead of remaining invisible or, at most, making vague references to 'the author', I also want to acknowledge the part I have played in interpreting and 'giving voice' to the people who spoke to me for the research. In other words, I want to accept responsibility for what is written, and the most straightforward way of doing this seems to be to explicitly write myself in. (1997, p.xvi)

Whilst wanting to use my own interpretative voice in the study, I did want to temper this with a range of methods for gathering information. I did not wish to go as far as some in embracing the personal voice - as far as Richardson for example, (1994, p.89) with her postmodern disregard for any notion of validity claims and for methodological authority. I wished instead, to engage in what Ball calls a 'disciplined subjectivity' in my research (Ball, 1990). It is perhaps this that O'Neill is getting at when she highlights the similarities between scientific research and research in drama. She claims that both demand

careful observation, generalisation and the expression of results in a community of scholars and educators. Like science, the study of drama requires detail and precision and will emphasise certain fundamental processes. Thinking creatively and critically, solving problems, constructing knowledge, 'reading' results and developing productive theories are as essential for development in the arts as in the sciences. (1996, p.138)

I feel comfortable with this description. It implies a determination to be as fair to the work as possible, and yet it acknowledges through the reference to 'reading' that interpretation is an inevitable part of the process. It is obviously a justification for non-positivist approaches, but at the same time affirms the importance of rigour in interpretative designs. I wanted that 'messy and untidy' research Brennan speaks of, to mix methods, to use my own voice and yet to balance findings with other significant data and theoretical arguments. In Robson's words, 'Real life science does not escape the messiness of other aspects of real life' (1993, p.19). My research design emerged as a hybrid, because 'it will be even better served by the marriage of two traditions' (Bryman, 1988, p.173). Such blends are becoming increasingly common. Burgess describes the use of diverse methods in tackling a research problem as 'multiple research strategies' (1982). The interpretative paradigm does not rest upon pure subjectivity; it opens up other perspectives to inform the subjective, thus making the process rigorous, disciplining itself.

O'Toole calls for research that draws from the breadth of the researcher's experience. He argues for Morgan's notion of research as a 'reflective conversation' (1983, p.374), which takes place between the researchers and their colleagues, their experience, their practice, their reading, the theorising of others in the field, and their assumptions. (O'Toole, 1996, pp.149-150). Morwenna Griffiths similarly argues that

ultimately knowledge can only be produced through the careful consideration of individual experience. But be warned! Your experience is not enough on its own. You will need to use it carefully: bearing in mind relevant theory and your political position. And you will have to

be prepared to reflect and re-think your understanding of the experience over time. (Cited in Sikes, 1997, p.xviii)

It is the way the conversation takes place, the reflection and rethinking, that is significant. A claim to contribute to our understanding of the field of drama education will ultimately rest on the “trustworthiness” of my account; the appropriateness of data collection and analysis, interpretation of analytical statements and reporting of the research’ (Bassey, 1999, p.11). Those who will judge the ‘trustworthiness’ of my account are those with the professional knowledge of the field of drama education and their verdict will be dependant upon whether it seems to be true or not. Golby reaffirms my resolve for trustworthiness, arguing that in case study as in other approaches, a sound set of procedures is required for measuring, to ensure the researcher is not accused of mere subjectivity or impressionism. Often, therefore, multiple sources of evidence are recommended. (Golby, 1994, p.21). The observations, interviews and examination of literature would provide three sources.

At the outset I considered using my own practice of teacher-in-role as a focus for the study. This approach is becoming more common in educational contexts. Taylor has written extensively about the rich potential of Schon’s reflective practitioner model for research in the field of drama education (Schon, 1987, Taylor, 1996, 1998). Taylor identifies the potential for research to impact directly on practice and practice on research in this model. It requires consistent evaluation of what is taking place. ‘... the reflective practitioner stance demands a discovery of self, a recognition of how one interacts with others, and how others read and are read by this intersection’ (Taylor, 1996, p.27). Winston (1998) and Gallagher

(2000) use their own teaching as the basis for research in a classroom context. Their interpretations are analysed in conjunction with video footage, and the comments of both participants and observers. Here there is an acceptance of a personal voice, but at the same time the stories of others are included in the interpretation as a way to enhance the validity of the research projects. My own practice of teacher-in-role at first seemed a possibility, but unlike the research of Taylor, Winston and Gallagher, mine required a comparison with a group working outside education. I had to observe and interview actors in order to compare their work with that of teacher-in-role. But I could not evaluate myself in the same way as I could the actor whom I would observe. I could not observe the work of an actor and interview her and present a comparison with what I do in role, and then give teacher role and acting the same analysis. I needed to use other drama practitioners so that I could run the same procedure with all the case study subjects in the same way. With other drama educators I could observe just as I would the actors; I could interview just as I would the actors; and I could interpret from the same position as I could the actors. Hence, given my desire to maximise research credibility, I made the decision not to use my own teacher-in-role work in this study, but to use the work of others.

I prepared to carry out the case studies of each group, teachers and actors, to seek to identify what is particular, and to understand the activities in relation to a wider set of theoretical ideas. I prepared with the knowledge that views on acting are unstable, notions of role vary, and that individual teachers will not use role in exactly the same way as other teachers, but distinctively and perhaps uniquely, and the same for actors. Furthermore, what is *knowable* remains insecure. Just as I have identified the narratives that may be an issue for the

researcher, so also will there be the particular narratives of the case study subjects. Clare Venables, a director at the Royal Shakespeare Company, (2000) claims that actors are not generally good at discussing and describing their work partly due to the absence of any theoretical framework. Much work for both actors and teachers is done instinctively, some of which they are not even aware of doing. Equally, both are aware of the familiar stories about their artistic activity, the prevalent discourses about acting and role. There is a history in which teachers have distinguished between acting and role. There is no such tradition for actors.

RESEARCH METHOD

The research method can be divided into two interlinking stages. Firstly, the theoretical research, and secondly, the fieldwork and case studies. The first is straightforward and can be quickly introduced, but the second will need to be examined carefully below. They are interlinked because the theoretical research influenced the way the data collected in the case studies was analysed.

1. Theoretical research

The theoretical research provided the groundwork for contextualising the case studies as samples of practice. In order to respond to my research question, I needed first of all to ascertain answers to the following five questions:

- What are the widely held assumptions about the differences between acting and teacher-in-role?
- What has been written about teacher-in-role and its distinctiveness from acting?
- How is acting conceptualised by those in the field of drama in education?
- How is acting conceptualised and defined in the literature of theatre and performance?
- Which commonalities and distinctions can be identified between the two from the literature?

I adopted three approaches to this theoretical research. Firstly, in order to consider whether or not teacher-in-role is acting, research was required into what had been published on both acting and teacher-in-role. 'The guiding principle in document analysis is [nevertheless] that everything should be questioned' (Bell, 1999, p.116). Hence, as well as identifying arguments about acting and teacher-in-role, I looked for the underlying assumptions behind all that I read. Secondly, since there has been very little precedent for analysing teacher-in-role from a theatrical perspective, I needed to re-examine what had been written about teacher-in-role in the light of the literature on acting. This bringing together of two literatures created a defamiliarisation process that allowed me to analyse well-known literature in the field of drama in education through a new perspective. Thirdly, I approached documentary analysis as a way to illuminate the relationship between teacher-in-role and acting and to consider a range of theatrical traditions to see if some had more specific connections with teacher-in-role than others.

This first aspect of the research is set out in Section Two of the thesis.

2. Fieldwork: Research of practice

The case studies provided the samples of practice for analysis. The first concern was how to select the case study subjects.

Selection of case study subjects

The teachers were selected on the grounds of their

- contributions to the field of drama in education
- significance in terms of international influence through both theoretical and practical work.
- geographical location
- influence upon my own development

The significance of the first two points was crucial. I wanted to be able to analyse the work of key figures who have influenced practice and theory, because this brings weight to my findings. I was interested in geographical location as a potential factor that might or might not influence practice. The fourth criterion took into account my personal position in the project. Since I had the opportunity to study individuals' work in depth, I wanted to choose teachers whose work has particularly influenced me, to enable me to be openly reflexive, acknowledging my experience of having learnt from them with the possibility that this might be significant.

David Booth, Cecily O'Neill, and John O'Toole fulfilled these criteria. Though they all trained with Bolton and Heathcote, each has worked predominantly in different continents, which allowed for the possibility that distinct practices might have emerged in different geographical and cultural locations.

The actors were more difficult to choose, given my lack of familiarity with individuals in the field. A range of strategies aided my selection.

- I studied texts providing transcripts of interviews with actors to see who among them had attempted to describe the process;
- I sought the advice of Royal Shakespeare Company theatre director, Clare Venables;
- I looked to see who was performing at the time when I wished to carry out the work.

As a result I wrote to three actors.

- Kathryn Hunter was chosen because of the breadth of her work and the challenges she has undertaken. As well as playing a significant Lear, she has worked with *Théâtre de Complicité* with director Simon McBurney. With *Complicité* she was involved in devising and developing improvisations from exercises and games. I thought that this might create a slightly different dimension that could be useful given the improvisational nature of the work of a teacher-in-role.

- Fiona Shaw's interviews interested me, and I had been struck by her portrayal of Hedda Gabler. She was recommended by Venables as articulate about her work and was about to perform the lead in *Medea* at The Abbey Theatre in Dublin.
- Simon Callow seemed an obvious choice given his writing on the subject of being an actor. I was familiar with his books and he was touring *The Mysteries of Charles Dickens*. His solo performance confirmed Callow as a good case study choice because it provided a different yet particular connection with teacher-in-role. Callow was single-handedly shaping the dramatic encounter and playing as many roles. Similarly, the teacher-in-role is, at least initially, shaping the drama, and playing as many roles as are required in one dramatic event.

Research in practice - Given my eventual decision to reduce the number of case studies explained earlier, a decision was needed as to which ought to be selected:

Since David Booth was likely to be my external examiner, I was advised to save my case study material on his work to use in another context, and to include O'Neill and O'Toole in this thesis.

I had completed only two interviews with actors by this stage. I found that I could use the significant parts of the data from the fieldwork on Callow in the theoretical section of the thesis, and use the material from Shaw for the in-depth actor case study.

Preparing for the case studies

There were two key considerations which I recognised from the outset would affect this research project regarding the management of the case studies.

- 1. The relationship between teachers and actors: drama teachers assume some degree of understanding of what actors do and are therefore able to discuss their ideas for comparison. Actors are not generally aware of teacher-in-role and cannot therefore be expected to compare it with acting. I found it was complicated discussing the research project with the actors since they did not know what I meant by teacher-in-role.
- 2. My familiarity with one group and not the other. I had to endeavour to ensure the procedures adopted in the process would be as appropriate for the teachers as for the actors with whom I was unfamiliar. The fieldwork put me in the position of being an ‘insider’ for some interviews and an ‘outsider’ for others.

My position with teachers: ‘insider’	My position with actors: ‘outsider’
Familiar with case study subjects	Unfamiliar with case study subjects
Familiar with the practice of teacher-in-role	Much less familiar with the practice of acting
Familiar with the discourse	Less familiar with the discourse
Confident in the theoretical field	Less confident in the theoretical field

Inevitably it would be easy to bring my familiarity to the fore and, making assumptions, miss important details in the teacher case studies. At the same time, I was more likely to assume

atypical events as typical and hence assume false inferences and consequently construct less justifiable generalisations in the more unfamiliar territory of the actors' work.

To counteract this discrepancy, I had to carry out the fieldwork 'attending to [my] own cultural assumptions as well as to the data' (McCracken, 1988, cited in Brennen, 1992). The systems with which I collected the data (described below) were therefore designed to enable me to 'be flexible and reflexive and yet somehow manufacture distance' (McCracken, 1988, cited in Brennen, 1992) from the very familiar drama education context. In practice, this was helped by the fact that the actor observation served to defamiliarise my teacher observations, echoing what had taken place with the analysis of literature.

Preparing for observations

Four points required consideration during my preparation for observation:

- My position as observer
- The focus of the observations
- How to record what I observed
- Understanding the data collected

1. My position as observer

I realised that the data would reveal not what actually happened, but my perception of what happened (Nisbet and Watt, 1980, p.13), so I needed to heed Bell's advice to 'be aware of the

dangers and do [my] best to eliminate preconceived ideas and prejudices' (1999, p.158). As a non-participant observer, I was at least free of the criticisms levelled at participant observers detailed by Cohen and Manion (1994, pp.110-11). The 'dangers of "going native"' would not be an issue. I determined to remember that as observer 'your role is to observe and record in as objective a way as possible and then to interpret the data you gather' (1999, p.158). At the same time I recognised that some data collected would inevitably be interpreted during the observation and must be treated differently from objectively recorded data, as can be seen below in the 'raw' and 'interpretative' data grid.

2. The focus of the observations

The theoretical research was crucial in preparing me for what to look for during observation. It had provided me with a range of concepts about teacher-in-role and acting, about the skills involved in both, the distinctions between social role and aesthetic role, and about notions of transformation. This gave me a clear idea of what to look for. Signs, which distinguished the teacher and actor when they were in and out of role, could be identified, and the degree with which any physical transformation took place. I also wanted to be ready for the unexpected. The video recordings enabled me to look over these moments more carefully.

3. How to record what I saw

Gathering data through observation is not easy in all circumstances and the different contexts of the two groups in my research did not allow for the same observational treatment.

Teacher	Actor
Video possible	Video not possible
Notes taken throughout What I might have missed during note taking, I could observe on the video later	Notes could not be taken throughout - the darkness in the auditorium made note taking difficult - there was a risk of offending others in the audience - looking down at notes could lead to important moments being missed
As an observer, sitting aside from all participants, I was not part of the dramatic experience	In observation, I was still an audience member, and therefore part of the performance experience, sitting amongst others who were more fully engaged in the theatre event

A range of strategies was adopted to reduce the discrepancies inevitable in these different observation experiences.

- I reread *Medea* before seeing Shaw perform (though I knew the play very well already). This would remove my attention from the narrative element.
- I saw two live performances of *Medea*
- Immediately after the performance I took time to embellish the very brief notes I had made in the dark during the performance.

4. Understanding the data collected

It was possible in advance to identify data as either ‘raw or interpretative’, as distinguished by Winston (1998, p.95). He describes raw data as ‘evidence with no specific interpretative focus at the time it was collected’ and interpretative data as that which ‘was, from the outset, concerned with evaluative judgments’. Both raw and interpretative data are detailed in the table below.

RAW DATA	INTERPRETATIVE DATA
A description of the lesson’s or play’s events	Notes on connections between theory and practice
Video recording of lessons	
Audio recordings of interviews	
Descriptive notes of gestures and other semiotic features, such as pitch of voice	Decoding of semiotics e.g. gesture, voice, space

Understanding the data in these terms reasserted the distance that can be placed between the data and the researcher. It exposes when the positionality of the researcher is significant, so that interpretations can be triangulated with colleagues and checked if possible against other information sources. There were, for example, some particular hand gestures made by O’Toole in role that I interpreted as supportive to the participants in role, but I wanted to be sure that this interpretation was one that might be drawn by other drama practitioners.

Preparing for interviews

My preparation focussed upon three questions:

- How structured should the interviews be?
- What should I ask?
- When should I carry out the interview?

I assumed that the observations would throw up different implications that I might wish to explore. Semi-structured interviews gave the flexibility to engage in dialogue concerning points of interest that might arise in discussion, too. 'A major advantage of the interview is its adaptability. A skilful interviewer can follow up ideas, probe responses and investigate motives and feelings' (Bell, 1999, p.135).

The interviews needed to be handled carefully since, 'Asking questions and getting answers is a much harder task than it may seem at first. The spoken or written word has always a residue of ambiguity, no matter how carefully we word the questions and report or code the answers.' (Fontana & Frey, 1994, p.361). I had also to consider the difference between the two subject groups and their working environments and therefore decided that the same questions could not be asked in all interviews.

The interviews took place at least twenty-four hours after the observations which gave me time to consider what I had seen, the questions I might ask and also to create some distance between the subject and her/his work.

The Fieldwork Process

As a result of the preparations above, I set out to maximise the trustworthiness of my findings by systematising the fieldwork process as illustrated below:

Fieldwork action	Rationale
Observation notes – ‘raw’ e.g. description of activity, details of particular gestures	To provide an objective description of the events and actions that took place
Observation notes – ‘interpretative’ e.g. interpretation of particular gestures	To make a record of my responses to and interpretations of the events and actions that took place
Video recordings of teachers	To enable a more tranquil examination at a later date, and to enable the practice to be shown to others for the purposes of triangulation
Recorded interview	To produce transcripts to enable a close analysis of what was said
Subsequent request for information about themselves from teacher subjects	To provide a new, up-to-date perspective on the teachers’ practice. Shaw was not included since I have access to very recent interviews as a result of her success in <i>Medea</i>
Subsequent sending of the selected highlights from the interviews to subjects	To enable the case study subjects to respond to my editing decisions and ensure that ethical standards were maintained
Discussion with colleagues	To check that my interpretations were not solely personal, but shared by others. In the event, there were no significant discrepancies due to the clear signing of the role players.

Inevitably the process of analysing the data collected led me to think beyond the data itself. I could not analyse what I had seen without reflecting on a myriad of experiences, many of which were on-going in my personal and professional life during the lifetime of this research

project. The analyses would inevitably be informed by such experiences, as O'Toole suggests (1996). These include

- reading, particularly that which contributed to the research of Section Two
- acting
- teacher-in-role work
- observation of the work of many other teachers in role
- observation of many other actors
- the other case studies
- discussion with colleagues

Testing the hypothesis

Verma and Beard describe a hypothesis as 'a tentative proposition which is subject to verification through subsequent investigation'. The 'tentative proposition' is that what teachers do in role is acting. It is a proposition that is subject to some degree of verification through the research project. 'In many cases hypotheses are hunches that the researcher has about the existence of relationship between variables' (Verma and Beard, 1981, p.184) While Verma and Beard's formulation seeing hypotheses as relations between distinct variables indicates their commitment to a positivist methodology, in an analogous way, I have a hypothesis –or hunch- and I too seek to support it in a rigorous way. My hunch was that there is a closer relationship between teachers in role and actors than the literature of the field would suggest. The approaches to verifying my hunch are various in this hybrid, triangulated

research project. The six key ways I hoped would illuminate the hypothesis and enable me to reach a conclusion about my hunch are listed below:

Approach to testing the hypothesis	What the approach provided
An exploration of the concept of acting from literature of the field (Section Two)	Possible bench marks against which teacher-in-role could be examined
An exploration of the concept of teacher-in-role from literature of the field (Section Two)	A clear notion of what has been written to date about teacher-in-role.
An analysis of the relationship between teacher-in-role and acting according to general assumptions, by setting features of each along side one another (Section Two)	Enabled me to bring theories of teacher-in-role & acting together and examine them for commonalities and distinctions
Teasing out the assumptions behind the view that teacher-in-role is not acting (Section Two and also in the case studies, Section Three)	Provided an opportunity to consider the rationale for a distinction between teacher-in-role & acting
A semiotic analysis of the practice of teacher-in-role and acting ¹ (Section Three)	Opportunity to see if the theatrical semiotic model derived the same sorts of information and conclusions from both practices
Direct comparison between teacher and actor views about acting (Section Three)	Opportunity to identify differences, similarities and implicit assumptions of teachers and actors about acting

Presenting the data

Each of the case studies follows the same presentational format:

- introduction to the case study subject
- the context of the observation
- narrative account of session/play
- semiotic analysis of session/play

¹ The semiotic framework was constructed especially for this research project. I had not before come across teacher-in-role being examined through a semiotic reading, but wanted to use a consciously ‘objective’ or distanced framework to help analyse its performative processes. The detailed rationale for my semiotic model, and the reservations held about semiotics are explained in the Introduction to Case Studies.

- selected highlights from the interview
- analysis of the interview
- contextualising the case study in the light of theoretical issues raised in Section Two

This second stage of the research is set out in Section Three. Most of the interviews are included in the case studies. The tapes of the interviews are included as Appendix 8.

SECTION TWO: RISING ACTION

DESTABILISING DISTINCTIONS AND DEFINITIONS

INTRODUCTION

In the introduction I suggested that it was time to challenge the widely held view that the teacher-in-role is ‘emphatically not acting’ (O’Neill, 1991, p.4). In my attempt to demonstrate that the two may actually be far closer than has been assumed, the obvious step was to define both practices, compare them and identify any similarities between the two. This, as Section One infers, is not so simple.

Before I embarked on the project, I made a preliminary list of questions that I wished to answer by the end of my research. The list was completed over three days. (Appendix 3).

The first two questions were:

What is the distinction between teacher-in-role and acting?

What are the commonalities between teacher-in-role and actor-in-role?

These questions assume a neat uncomplicated approach to the inquiry. The last two questions on the list were:

Is it possible to identify a consensus of what teachers and actors believe they are doing in role?

Is there enough of a consensus to compare?

On day one I asked ‘What is the distinction...?’ By the end of the three days, I had begun to wonder whether there would even be a consensus with which to make a comparison. This shift from neat categories to the blurring of hard distinctions that emerged during those three days through my list of questions, was a microcosm of what was to follow over the next four years. This section, committed to theoretical research, explores the destabilising of distinctions and definitions.

The canonical texts of drama in education tend to point to a distinction between teacher-in-role and acting, as we shall see later in Section Two. However, when I have worked in role with teachers, I have sometimes been asked what kind of acting work I usually do, which suggests that they do not see a difference. Unsure whether the distinctions between concepts of teacher-in-role and acting were confined to the literature or held by the average teacher, I asked a group of teachers who used teacher-in-role, but were not trained in drama, to list features of each practice under two headings.¹

The grid below sets out the results.

¹ This in-service training session was held in Northamptonshire in 1998 when I first began this research project.

CATEGORISING TIR AND ACTOR: THE FIRST MODEL

TEACHER-IN-ROLE

ACTOR

Overall power in the experience	the teacher is privileged	the audience is privileged
Content	chosen by teacher	given to the actor
Intention	to fulfil learning objectives	to entertain
Responsibility for audience welfare & behaviour	fully & legally responsible	no responsibility
Audience attendance	compulsory	voluntary
Audience expectation	to learn (to be bored/interested?)	to be entertained (to be challenged/amused?)
Audience role	active participation	inactive participation
Audience relationships	familiar	unfamiliar
Audience size	small group	large group
Audience age	school age	mixed, usually a minority under 25 years
Social class of audience	in state system-mixed, often without upper middle & usually without upper class	predominantly middle and upper class
Selection of role	can be chosen, & can change at any time	given before event & cannot be changed
Response to audience reaction	flexibility to adapt & challenge audience assumptions	no verbal flexibility, no possibility to respond
Environment	school hall/classroom	theatre space

Taking this grid at face value I could believe my initial question answered: *what is the distinction between teacher-in-role and acting?* The two activities are distinguished on many counts and look very different. However, on close examination it can be seen that the features listed under ‘actor’ are associated with the dominant Western model of theatre, despite the fact that this is not representative of all actors’ work. So my final question *Is there enough of a consensus to compare?* becomes significant. If the grid does not represent all types of actor work, then there may not be a consensus with which to make a comparison.

We tend to assume that there is a consensus that we can pin down with definitions, but when we do so we are misunderstanding the slippery nature of language. In addition to the problem identified above that there are different forms of acting, it is also the case that there are different types of teacher role players, teacher roles, and ways to play them. This highlights the problem of language. Wittgenstein famously abandoned his view that the structure of reality determines the structure of language expressed in the *Tractatus* (1922). This gave way to a perception of the limits of language and an articulation in *Philosophical Investigations* (1953) that our language determines our view of reality, since we see things through language. (Pears, 1971, p.13 and pp.55-68).

Saussure, too, has pointed to the limitations of language, arguing that it only gives us a *version* of reality, and fails to take us to any sense of a “Real” (1966). Saussure is credited by many writers such as Culler (1976) and Selden and Widdowson (1993) as the main founding father of Structuralism. Structuralism presents language as a system in which a linguistic sign has two elements. Firstly, the actual sound which Saussure calls the ‘signifier’. This is arbitrary. That a tree is called a ‘tree’ is arbitrary. The second element, is the ‘signified’ which is the concept that is created in an individual’s mind when the signifier is heard. Saussure argued that the world of language and the world of reality are not the same, and further that ‘Words articulate our experience of things, they do not just express or reflect it;’ (Robey, 1991, p.47).

In line with this approach, definitions, as James Clifford says of stories and narratives, are “constructed, artificial ... cultural accounts” (Clifford, 1986, p.2). Definitions often purport to be definitive, telling us what acting and role really are, when in fact, all we can hope from language is an articulation of our experience of things. So definitions and

distinctions must be examined to identify the experiences and assumptions that have shaped their construction.

Saussure argued that 'the very concepts a language expresses are also defined and determined by its structure. They exist, not intrinsically, as themselves... and not positively, by their actual content, but negatively, by their formal relations with other terms in the structure' (Hawkes, 1977, p.28). Hence oppositions are identified which mean that a concept's 'most precise characteristic is in being what the others are not' (Saussure, cited in Hawkes, (1978, p.117). This structuralist tendency to identify binary oppositions is evident in our simple model above. In order to establish an understanding of teacher-in-role, features describing what it is *not* have been identified, and as we shall see later in this section, that path all too readily leads to the claim that teacher-in-role is not acting. Territories and boundaries are thus established and the oppositions serve to alienate the possibility of any room between them.

In tune with the poststructuralist approach, I wish to challenge the seeming solidity of these binary oppositions and expose a middle ground. The poststructuralists and indeed the postmodernists invite us to conceptualise boundaries as fluid, pointing to the instability of concepts and challenging any sense of the fixed. I seek to illustrate the temporary and unstable nature of definitions and conceptualisations through a critique of the oppositions established, and to propose a more fluid notion of teacher-in-role and acting.

To this end I now turn my attention to the seminal literature in the field of drama in education and acting. I will first consider the attempts at definitions and their limitations,

and then address five specific areas for comparison that emerged during the research as significant.

- **Contexts and Audience Relationships.** How do the contexts differ and affect the relationship with the 'audience'?
- **Functions and Aims.** What are the functions and aims of the actor and the teacher-in-role?
- **Skills.** What are the necessary skills and tools required to carry out acting and teacher-in-role?
- **Approaches.** What sorts of approaches are employed to create a role by teachers and actors? Do different roles require different approaches for both actor and teacher-in-role?
- **Assumptions.** What assumptions about acting and theatre underlie the literature of drama in education? Why have these assumptions been held?

The investigation of these five areas has three objectives. Firstly, to re-examine what has been written about teacher-in-role in the light of literature on acting. Secondly, to re-examine the possibility that the teacher-in-role engages in acting behaviour in the light of a consideration of a range of theatrical traditions. Thirdly, given the above, to establish theoretical reference points to clarify discussion later in the thesis, and provide a framework for analysing the case studies.

When looking at the literature in the field of drama in education, I shall focus particularly on the writing of those drama in education practitioners not included in the case studies. Attention is given particularly to Morgan and Saxton's *Teaching Drama* (1987) and many publications of Gavin Bolton. These are formative, well-known texts that most people using teacher-in-role will be very familiar with. They have had influence on both practice and thinking. The rationale for selecting Morgan and Saxton's *Teaching Drama* was its detailed examination of role (with regard to the teacher) and acting (with regard to the students). The reason that I give particular attention to the work of Bolton is because he has explored the roles of children in class drama and has suggested that these roles can be considered 'acting behaviour'. His work has obvious parallels with this research project.

DEFINITIONS

Here I shall consider the various uses and connotations of the terms *role* and *acting*. Attention is given to social role and distinctions between the role of teacher and teacher-in-role. I wish to address the lack of distinction made between social and aesthetic acting in the literature, and broaden the field's conceptualisation of acting.

Both *role* and *acting* are used widely with slightly different meanings or connotations. A child 'acting up' means something very different from Fiona Shaw 'acting' Medea convincingly, and the role of the night club bouncer is different from Shaw getting the lead 'role' of Medea. These distinctions are fairly obvious at first glance. But, what is the child doing to be described as '*acting up*'? Presumably acting in a particular way that is designed to attract the attention of others with an awareness of onlookers and a desire to elicit a particular response; an altered behaviour. Fiona Shaw is also doing all of these things. The night club bouncer needs to present himself in a particular way in order to be effective as a bouncer. He will not fulfil his role if he does not look like a bouncer. He cannot look afraid, or those observing him will not believe he could do what a bouncer has to do: deal with the drunk and violent. Fiona Shaw similarly, must present herself in a particular way in order to be effective as Medea. She will not fulfil her role if she does not look appropriate for Medea. She cannot look weak and timid, or those observing her will not believe she could do what Medea has to do: kill the princess and her own two sons. Of course, there *are* differences in both cases; the bouncer is not paid to be stared at (though he is paid to be seen), Shaw is; neither bouncer nor child are behaving as if they had different identities, but Fiona Shaw is. While these distinctions are straight forward, we will see that not even these seemingly obvious distinctions will always operate.

Role

'Role' presents particular problems. Modernity has made us more aware not only that we all play a multitude of roles, but also that some people will go to extraordinary lengths to manage the impressions we have of them. Thus in the British 2001 election the Prime Minister, aware of people's general cynicism towards politics and politicians, deliberately sought to present himself as sincere. In some cases the image may be so successfully portrayed that we are unable to tell the difference between image and reality. This is Baudrillard's nightmare; his vision of 'the generation by models of a real without origin or reality' (Poster, 1988). An example is presented by Inglis:

President' Clinton's appeal to 'my fellow Americans', his warmth and geniality, his sincere and likability, attentiveness to others however dim and dull, his suppression of intelligence and fluency, all of which were so brilliantly modelled for him by Robert Redford in the 1972 masterpiece 'The Candidate' (1993, p.11).

The significance of role in contemporary public life has led to a playfulness with roles. Post-modern theatre frequently plays with the notions of conventional roles of actors and audience. Peepolikus' performers stopped themselves moving too far forward in *Goosebumps* (2000), saying that they nearly crossed the line that distinguished them from us, the audience, thus playing with traditionally held assumptions about the roles of actors and audience. But while we are more aware of role playing, understanding distinctions between types of role is no less difficult. If actors and audience do not simply retain their distinctive roles, but play with them, clear-cut definitions become difficult. Peepolikus brought audience members into the performance space and even gave them the opportunity to determine events during the performance. At that moment, were they

audience or performers? This post-modern blurring of distinctions clouds possibilities for neat categorisation. This is why Zarrilli claims that with the constant challenges to traditions and conventions, and with constant experiments in performance, all we can seek are temporary understandings and temporary definitions of practices (1996).

Role

Role is a very common term. An actor prepares her 'role' (meaning a part in a play), 'roles' are taken in games (a function in the game, such as banker in Monopoly), and individuals take on roles in an office context (tea maker, boss). Gavin Bolton has heard what he supposes to be an 'old wives' tale' to explain the origins of the word 'role'. It is that the actor's script used to be written on a roll of papyrus!(2001) There may be no truth in the story but it connects the word 'role' directly with the actor. It is a word associated with the job of the actor. But the term 'role' has moved into the context of social performance and no longer remains exclusively tied to the domain of theatre.

I must make it clear at this point that I need to draw parameters around my research field so that it does not get too broad and therefore, too thin. I am interested here in 'teacher-in-role' and not social role. I do believe that there is much work to be done concerning the relationship between teacher-in-role and social role, and social role and acting, but these are other research projects. I wish to restrict myself to the teacher-in-role and its relationship to acting. Therefore only a brief resume of notions of social role is appropriate and a brief consideration of the role of the teacher in so far as it helps our understanding of teacher-in-role. Our tracking of ideas about role will include consideration of the work of Richard Sennett, George Herbert Mead and Erving Goffman.

Richard Sennett considers the tradition of the *theatrum mundi*. The ancient Greek notion of *theatrum mundi* is literally that the world is seen as though it is a theatre.

One of the oldest Western ideas of human society is to see society itself to be a theater. There is the tradition of 'theatrum mundi'. Human life as a puppet show staged by the gods was Plato's vision in the 'Laws'; society as a theater was the motto of Petronius' 'Satyicon'. In Christian times the theater of the world was often thought to have an audience of one, a God who looked on in anguish from the heavens at the strutting and the masquerades of His children below.

(1986, p.34)

References to such a concept are frequent in theatrical and literary texts. Shakespeare's lines in *As You Like It* are probably as familiar as any lines of theatre text:

*All the world's a stage,
And all the men and women merely players; They have their exits and their entrances,
And one man in his time plays many parts.*

(Act 2 scene vii)

The puppet show analogy Sennett cites, creates a sense of human lives being controlled by the gods, who metaphorically pull the strings. It is an image presenting humans without control of their own destinies. Webster captures this during the disturbing scene prior to the Duchess' death in *The Duchess of Malfi*. For the duchess it is the stars that hold her fate, but the effect is the same:

We are merely the stars' tennis - balls, struck and banded

Which way please them.

(1973, p.96)

This contrasts with Sennett's next example of a Christian god observing the foolishness of those on earth which creates a very different scenario. Here the humans on the stage of life, are not *controlled* by the gods, but are *observed* by a god. This presumably had the intention of keeping people's behaviour in order. As Sennett explains, the image of society as theatre has continued, yet cannot be given any single meaning because it has existed in so many contexts. While Sennett provides an illuminating account of the *theatrum mundi*, a more influential account which takes the theatrical analogy much further, can be found in the work of symbolic interactionists. Here we shall focus on two major writers, Mead and Goffman.

At the heart of the 19th century philosophy of 'pragmatism' was a concern with meaning. The meaning of an object was not to be seen as intrinsic to that object, but was determined according to the ways humans behaved towards it. We could treat a chair as an object of worship or as a perch for a pet parrot. In these two contexts the meaning of the chair would be quite different, yet the physical nature of the chair would remain the same. It was this concern with the way humans make meaning of what surrounds them that forms the starting point of symbolic interactionism, and it is this which fuelled a new articulation of social roles.

George Herbert Mead an early exponent of symbolic interactionism, argued that individuals were distinct from animals because they sought meaning in occurrences

(1934). Hence a dog kicked will bark or bite whether the kicker was angry, hated the dog or wanted to aggravate the dog's owner. The dog's reaction would not differ according to the kicker's motive. A girl kicked, however, may kick back if the kick was understood to be provocative. But if she thought it was due to the mental illness of the kicker, she would probably not kick, but react quite differently. If she thought that the kicker had wanted her attention and had not intended the kick to be so hard, she might react differently again. 'For Mead, this ability [to attribute meanings] involves the distinctly human capacity to put oneself in the place of others, and to see oneself from the point of view of others. This he calls *role-taking*' (Pilkington et al 1997, p.678) because in order to attribute meaning to the kick, the girl has to imagine the point of view of the kicker. For our purposes, then, we see that role is associated with imagining a situation from the point of view of another. This reflects common perceptions of what an actor does when he takes a role. The actor must imagine the motivations for the behaviour of someone else in order to take a role. The girl does not act out or become anyone else, but she imagines someone else's position. This is very similar to Dorothy Heathcote's description of dramatic improvisation:

Very simply it means putting yourself in other people's shoes and, by using personal experience to help you, to understand their point of view (1967, p. 27)

Erving Goffman, the most influential symbolic interactionalist, pushed the familiar *theatrum mundi* analogy further by constructing a full model of society as drama. This was not a new idea, as we have seen, but he took the model further than it had been taken before, because here, rather than acting for an external viewer, the actors acted for each other. Human beings are not performing inadvertently to an audience beyond the earth,

but adjusting their behaviour deliberately to perform to each other. He believed it would help us to understand 'the way in which the individual in ordinary work situations presents himself and his activity to others, the ways he guides and controls the impression they form of him' (1990, Preface). Goffman argues that humans are constantly expressing themselves to others according to the impression they wish to be formed by the audience of their expression.

When an individual plays a part he implicitly requests his observers to take seriously the impression that is fostered before them. They are asked to believe that the character they see actually possesses the attributes he appears to possess, that the task he performs will have the consequences that are implicitly claimed for it, and that, in general, matters are what they appear to be. In line with this, there is the popular view that the individual offers his performance and puts on his show 'for the benefit of other people'.

(1990, p.28)

Goffman does provide us with an interesting way of looking at human interaction and his model will be particularly useful in considering the role of the teacher.

The idea of *performance* is crucial to Goffman's analysis. It refers to any activity of a participant in a social interaction that influences other participants. He identifies the possibility of individuals playing their roles with or without conviction. The theatre terminology extends to 'front stage' and 'back stage' to describe separate regions of social interaction. The teacher at a parents' evening will take on the role of teacher for the parents 'front stage' and then relax in the staff room 'back stage.' However, once in the staff room there is a different performance for a different audience: teaching colleagues.

Particularly interesting is Goffman's notion of role distance. Individuals often distance themselves from the role they are occupying by making communications out of character with the role, thus showing themselves to be more than the role being performed. Hence, the teacher at parents' evening may also reveal her role as parent, too, in order to share something with the parents in front of her. This is similar to the concept of the 'two fold identity' of the actor and character (Beckerman, 1990, p.101). Harrop explains that the 'performer is both the actor and the character...supremely conscious of the duality' (1992, p.74). The teacher, too would be aware of the duality, allowing the formal role of teacher to reveal too the parent self. But it is a little more complex, yet. The Goffman line, in contrast to that of Mead, would suggest that behind one role can be revealed not a self, but another role. While we see a character and are also aware of the actor, the actor according to Goffman is, in one sense, just playing another role in a performance space. Behind the character is the actor in her professional role of the performer. The human subject becomes nothing more than the sum of the roles she plays.

Though Goffman made it very clear that his report was an analogy and only a temporary one, 'Scaffolds, after all, are to build other things with, and should be erected with an eye to taking them down' (ibid. p.246), his concept of 'roles' in social encounters has remained very influential.

The limitations that Goffman himself recognises in his theatrical analogy are worthy of note. He admits that 'this attempt to press a mere analogy so far was in part a rhetoric and a manoeuvre', acknowledging that 'The claim that all the world's a stage is sufficiently commonplace for readers to be familiar with its limitations and tolerant of its presentation.' (1990, p.246). He poses two limitations. Firstly, 'the stage presents activity

which is imaginary and rehearsed whilst social behaviour is real and frequently unplanned.’ and secondly, that ‘in social life the audience often takes a very much more active role than it does in the theatre’ (Pilkington, 1995, p.680)². The system has however, received more weighty criticism. Two significant criticisms are firstly, the encounters Goffman describes have no historical contexts. As Sennett points out, the people engaged in encounters seem to have no past and there is no clear social context within which they are operating. Secondly, the analogy Goffman draws admits of no morality.

Goffman's social world is empty of objective standards of achievement; it is so defined that there is no cultural or social space from which appeal to such standards could be made ... imputations of merit are themselves part of the contrived social reality whose function is to aid or to contain some striving, role - playing will. Goffman's is a sociologist which by intention deflates the pretensions of appearance to be anything more than appearance.

(MacIntyre, 1981, p.109)

In Goffman's system human behaviour emerges as nothing beyond layers of role, and being an efficient performer of roles is what makes a human being successful. It does not account for the moments when people act with a sense of duty, a sense of justice and moral principle. We are asked to accept that humans are acting entirely with an awareness of how they will be seen. This suggests that there is nothing behind a set of roles, and that we can never act selflessly, or for moral reasons. Wiltshire, highly sceptical of all sociologists' use of the role-playing metaphor, goes further:

² It is noteworthy that Goffman has in mind a particular view of drama here, and does not for example, consider improvised drama as theatre.

The role-playing metaphor is exceedingly slippery and dangerous because almost inevitably when we deliberately transfer the notion of roleplaying to offstage life we carry with us, smuggled in, the notion of the fictionality of the actor's portrayal. This tends to eat away from the inside our sense of the reality, seriousness, and appropriateness of our "role playing" offstage (1991, p.xvi).

The argument logically leads us to the assumption that teachers are only acting in any given way because of the effect that their action may have on others. But, there are so many 'others' to consider at any one time, as Goffman recognises. A teacher might consider the effect on the governors, the parents, the head teacher, colleagues or children. Attempting to behave according to all these could lead to conflict since each could have different expectations of the teacher. This leaves the teacher with a quandary of how to deal with this dilemma. While for Goffman, the only way out is to adopt another role, arguably the individual can be seen as comprising a self who chooses what role to play. A further concern with the notion of a successful person being an effective performer of roles for the educationalist, is that ethical action is replaced by an over-riding concern with efficiency; being an effective teacher is disassociated from any broad moral and ethical considerations.

Goffman goes much further than Sennett and Mead in developing an analogy between society and the theatre. Indeed, Goffman pushed the analogy as far as it can go. While reservations can be expressed about the world view implicit in Goffman's extended analogy, nonetheless the concept of role-in no mean way influenced by Goffman's work- is so embedded in common sense that its roots in a theatrical analogy have now been forgotten. I shall adopt below the conventional conceptualisation of the teacher as a role

player, but I will do this without subscribing to all that surrounds Goffman's extended analogy.

Role of teacher : teacher-in-role

Given that social roles are no longer seen as analogous, but an integral part of social life, we need to draw a clear distinction between the social role of the teacher, and the activity we call 'teacher-in-role'. A clear distinction is hindered by recent conceptualisations of the teacher as a performer. Since Goffman, teachers see themselves as teachers playing a role as soon as they arrive on the school premises. They take the role of teacher, rather than the friend or parent they may have been earlier that morning. O'Hanlon explains that

All actions taken by teachers and professionals can be seen as role behaviour. But within the role taking is the identity of self. The act of teaching confers that professional identity of role upon the incumbent. This may be only one of many individual roles. The person is perceived as a repertory of roles, each one properly equipped with a certain identity. The teaching role identifies us to ourselves as teacher, which subsequently affects our behaviour as we perform "in role".

(1993, p.244)

There is a sense of inevitability expressed here. In becoming a professional, the role must be taken even though it is just one of many roles. This helps to distinguish between the social role we play as teacher, and the role we play as teacher-in-role. As teacher, I *must* take on the role as teacher. (I must not swear in my role as teacher, for example, though I may do as friend and colleague). As teacher-in-role however, I can select a role according to the plans for the lesson. As teacher I must be fair and polite, but as teacher-in-role I

might be unfair and rude. The parameters are different. The teacher-in-role occupies fictional contexts. The social rules that apply are those that are appropriate to the fictional context, rather than the actual context of the classroom. In my social role as teacher I blend into the school as a whole, but my teacher-in-role operates only in the confines of the space defined for the drama activity. For a moment, then, we can set up some oppositions.

Role of teacher	Teacher-in-role
a given	choice to take a role
no choice of role	choice of role
accepted moral code of teacher	option to break moral code of teacher
type/characteristics fairly restricted	less restriction on type
school context	fictional context within school context

The distinctions look clear enough, but of course, it is not as simple as it looks. In or out of role, the teacher is still a teacher and must control the class and take responsibility for their learning and well-being. Some classes may preclude particular teacher roles that could easily be taken with other classes. The absence of a choice of role for a teacher is not fully the case. Individuals make choices about the type of teacher they wish to be. Whilst there may be some restrictions, these differ from one school to another. Furthermore, the clear distinction between the two roles is complicated if we view the teacher as a *performer*. This refers to any teacher, not only drama teachers. Whatman’s research suggests that ‘people with experience in performing will readily adopt the roles required of teachers because their experiences of performance have taught them the processes of role taking’ (1998, p.46). She cites the work of Heck and William (1984), Tauber and Mester (1994), and Haigh (1995) who argue that ‘all teachers should be given a training in performance skills to enhance their teaching skills’ (ibid. p.48). This vision of teacher as performer is clearly not an analogy.

All the effective teachers, whatever their subject discipline, had certain things in common. They all seemed to have command, not only of their subject area but also of their teaching space. In addition they had a significant presence in the classroom, which enabled them to communicate effectively with their students. This was the first time I started to perceive all teachers as actors performing in a theatre - a theatre in their own classroom

(Warren, 1995, p.3)

Parkes, who also writes about the connections between teaching and performing, calls for training in performance, since this is what teachers do: perform. (1992, pp. 51-57). Whilst referring to a classroom as a theatre, Warren continues to refer to the teachers as social actors, rather than actors. Perhaps we can get a sense of the distinction through Whatman's description:

The essential element in the taking on of a role is that it is a deliberate and learned act which, when performed with skill, becomes internalised and can be interpreted by observers as real rather than assumed.

(Whatman, 1998, p.46)

What may be seen as different from the actor is Whatman's notion of internalisation. She identifies an internalisation as desirable for the teacher to perform her role as teacher. This is not widely required of the actor in contemporary theatre, though there have been and remain some advocates of the need for the actor to feel the experience of the role she is portraying, influenced by Stanislavski, as discussed earlier. Voice, organisation of space, and clear communication skills are all identified as the actor's skills that a teacher

requires. Haigh cited in Whatman, suggests that ‘with actor training, beginning teachers can analyse their own performances and are, therefore, less likely to become overwhelmed by failure. They can accept a poor performance at a particular point in time and not see this as an irretrievable personal failure.’ (Whatman, 1998, p.48). Perhaps this gives us a further clue that the teacher does not need to ‘be’ an actor, but certain skills of the actor should be acquired by teachers. The teacher needs to acquire a range of other skills in assessment, planning, time management and communication with parents and colleagues as well as classroom performance. If we adhere to this interpretation, then we can maintain our distinction between the teacher’s social role and teacher-in-role. If we take Warren’s ‘a theatre in their own classroom’ as analogous, rather than literal we can see that:

For the person in role as a teacher

- the classroom space does not take on a fictional context,
- the teacher does operate in the way expected of a teacher,
- the children maintain their roles as pupils.

Once the teacher moves into role, we assume a shift.

For the teacher-in-role

- the classroom space is transformed by a fictional context,
- the teacher does not necessarily operate in the way expected of a teacher,
- the children often move into fictional roles.

The distinctive lists above do not take into account that the teacher-in-role is still the person playing the role of teacher. Hence the first list must remain in the consciousness of the teacher-in-role. At any given moment a teacher-in-role can relinquish their fictional role and re-appear in the social role of the teacher. This is reminiscent of Goffman's idea of sets of roles all co existing. While the teacher is in a fictional role, the social role of teacher has not been neglected. It remains a possibility throughout the fiction and appears explicitly when required. This emergence of one role over another operates like the example of the teacher at a parents' evening we saw above.

The value of a performer's skills for teachers has been powerfully made, and we are aware of the fact that the teacher is playing a social role. However, though the arguments push the social role of teacher into a more theatrical frame, they do remain analogous. The performer's skills are useful to the teacher and the classroom functions *like* a theatre, but the teacher is not seemingly required to be an actor.

Social and aesthetic actor

Jonathan Neelands draws a comparison between the 'aesthetic' actor and the 'social' actor in much of his work. (1998a, 1998c). Like Morgan and Saxton, he places social role as the first level on an escalating 'role development' framework which culminates in a performance which is 'able to communicate the "truth" of a character' (*Beginning Drama: 11-14* 1998a, p.17). He explains that

Students understand from their everyday experience that any social event involves role-taking of some sort. When in public we consciously project a public image of self that is appropriate to the circumstances we find ourselves in. These public images may express a

social role such as parent or teacher and they may project an image of self such as being hard, cool, or not interested in boys/girls! The aesthetic actor builds on this idea of the social actor to create a public role that is a projection of another identity – to behave as Macbeth. (1998, pp.15-16)

He is proposing that the social role and the aesthetic role are not completely distinct, but that one is a further development from the other. However, the labels he gives (social and aesthetic) demonstrate a significant difference. In the extract above, Neelands draws upon Goffman's sense of adjusting behaviour for an audience in a social context and Sennett's sense of public social performance. It is worth noting that Goffman identified non-verbal aspects of role-taking (1990), such as props and costume. One can quickly make the connections with Neelands' examples. To look cool the prop of a mobile phone might be appropriate, or to look hard the costuming will be crucial. It is important to highlight Neelands' caveat about the framework of social role building up to 'actually being the character at the end' lest he be accused of holding the same view of theatre that we have identified above.

I am aware that the stages assume that the psycho-realist acting associated with realism ... presents the highest level of acting development. There are, of course, other traditions and uses of acting but for many young people the 'realism' of Stanislavski tradition is a measure of the quality of the acting they see on film and TV

(1998, p.16)

Later in this section we will be looking at some of the broad range of activity that is acting. However, at this point Neelands' model helps us examine whether the teacher in

the classroom and the teacher-in-role might be seen as social or aesthetic roles. Neelands, clearly distinguishes the aesthetic actor from the social actor because it 'is a projection of another identity'. This supports a view of the role of teacher as a social actor since it does not involve another identity, and the teacher-in-role would then be an aesthetic act since by definition, the teacher assumes another identity.

I wish to argue that the aesthetic aspect of the teacher-in- role, identified by Neelands is crucial. Most writers agree that the teacher-in-role is working within the dramatic art form as we saw earlier in this section. However, Toye and Prendiville have attempted to identify the social role of the teacher with the teacher-in-role:

Looking at 'role' in this sociological rather than theatrical perspective shifts the emphasis away from the skills of the actor in a stage sense to the development of the teacher as a social actor, that is specific semiotic skills appropriate for managing children in the classroom. TiR takes the social actor and the teacher as social actor and puts them in a fictional context.

(2000, p.52)

This notion of the teacher-in-role as the social actor in a fictional context seems similar to Neelands' view, but with one, rather important difference. Neelands acknowledges the aesthetic inherent in the teacher-in-role. If the teacher-in-role is simply a social actor in a fictional context, then the features making classroom drama an art form disappear. 'Dramatic language is distinguished by the fact that it will always carry more meaning than its obvious surface intentions' (O'Neill, 1995, p.82), just as gestures carry the same

extra signification. Language and gesture are read differently in the dramatic context from how they would be in life.

It is obvious that highlighting the similarities between social acting and teacher-in-role will make working in role appear less daunting for those who are new to it. If it requires no more than what is required of a teacher, then it will not present a problem. The skills of finding the right gestures for a social role are identified directly, by Toye and Prendeville, with the skills to be used in teacher-in-role:

Let us look at the distinctive features of this particular 'presentation of self'. As we have said, the teacher is using role, in the social actor sense, all the time. However, when we use TiR we are in a 'negotiated fictional situation'. Unlike the social acting that takes place 'in reality', this form of social acting is clearly a pretend activity by the teacher. You are behaving 'as if' you are someone else, and therefore you need to make it clear to the children, 'at all times' that you are 'pretending'. It is the first rule of the game you are playing ...

In taking on a role you will essentially take on an attitude, a viewpoint. You will use your filing cabinet of social actor skills and signal or sign your point of view. All that is required is that, through the words you use and your demeanour, you demonstrate someone with a particular view of the world.

(ibid.)

While this may sound reassuring for the newcomer to drama, it is misleading. 'All that is required' implies that what follows is simple. It is not. It is 'through your words and your demeanour, you demonstrate someone with a particular view of the world'. This is

complex. It is what actors are trained to do. While I do not deny that teachers are social actors, they are also social actors in many other contexts. In teacher-in-role, however, the contexts are fictional, just as they are for the actor. It is, therefore, difficult to see teacher-in-role as closer to the role of the teacher than to the actor. It is this lack of understanding that role playing off stage is distinctly different from role playing onstage because the latter is concerned with fiction that concerns Bruce Wiltshire (1991, p.xvi).

Bolton identifies as an aesthetic aspect of drama work, the 'manipulation of time and space' (1998, p.255). Earlier in this thesis we have seen functions of teacher-in-role described as playwright and director as an acknowledgement of what the teacher-in-role does to create the art form of drama. If teacher-in-role is simply to be viewed as the social actor in a fictional context, then we are denying the creative act. This is not simply the fiction. The teacher-in-role considers tension, contrasts, the structure and tempo of the drama. Her role is not to use the same gestures in life, since she signs in the language of theatre. Moments are deliberately highlighted in a way they are not in life. Tensions and contrasts are constructed for particular effect in a way they are not in life. Moments are made significant. I suggest that it is an error to reduce the teacher-in-role to a mere social role. If we lose the aesthetic, we are on difficult ground for identifying drama in education as art. Howell and Heap draw the same parallel between social roles and the teacher-in-role, but they acknowledge playing a social role as teacher as a 'small step into teacher-in-role within a process drama' (2001, p.49). This is truer to the framework that Neelands constructed which expresses a development of types of role with the social role as the most basic.

By identifying the social role that a teacher takes with a teacher-in-role, the artistic function of the teacher-in-role is lost. I wish to present a view of teacher-in-role as something other than a *form of social acting*, without denying that there are obvious similarities. I wish to reassert the sense of *analogy* that is enshrined in Goffman's model. The role of teacher is *analogous* to a dramatic role, without being a dramatic role.

We have now been able to identify social acting as the behaviour adopted in social roles, and the role of a teacher as a social and professional role that is enriched through the skills associated with the performer. In neither case did we find a fictional context. The fictional context came only with the teacher-in-role.

Bolton and Heathcote's book on role-play identifies two distinct traditions from which most leader-led role-play practices derive.

There is the 'simulation' tradition in which a 'real-life' work problem is replicated and the participants engage in solving it ... The learning outcome is to do with procedures and the effectiveness of individuals to follow them ... The second tradition has a 'counselling' basis. In these the emphasis is on sensitivity in groups and the honest facing up to one's behaviour in stressful work situations (1999, p.viii).

Bolton and Heathcote focus on a third type of role-play and are always primarily concerned with what needs to be learnt through the activity. They identify this practice 'as *rooted* in this one artistic characteristic of seeing something *as* significant. **This is essentially the dramatic methodology serving an educational purpose.**' (their highlight) (ibid. p.ix). The practice of role-playing identified 'coincides with the essence of theatre.

Both are about seeing something as significant' (ibid.). The writers refer to the 'Role-player' as playing a 'character'. So there is no distinction made between playing a role and playing a character in this book on roleplaying, just as I have argued that there is no distinction in theatre. The activity described is clearly different from the social roles of the teacher.

A continuum is emerging here. Bolton and Heathcote distinguish between three different types of role play. Their 'type' is clearly the one that is identified with theatre, where the role-players take on characters. The other two are not similarly defined. They both, however, engage the participants in role play in an imagined context and are therefore asking more of them than to engage in a simple social role.

Acting

Zarrilli's collection, *Acting (Re)Considered* (1996) has brought together the ideas of many theorists and practitioners who write with different perspectives on acting. When terms are unstable, assumptions loaded and language inadequate, with no certainties remaining in our post-modern culture, we can only look to temporary conceptualisations of acting. Zarrilli 'invites the reader to (re)consider both acting and discourses on acting.' He uses '(re)consider' to mark clearly the implicitly processual nature of "considering" (1996, p.1). We must acknowledge that the object for consideration keeps changing. With the constant challenges to traditions and conventions, and with constant experiments in performance, Zarrilli suggests that all we can expect to achieve are temporary understandings (1996).

With the limitations of our language, with the knowledge that our expressions will be located within a particular critical perspective and ideology, with continual changes in performance practice, we cannot expect to find a neat definition that appears to cover all types of acting behaviour. However, there have been many attempts to express what is understood by theatre and acting. My concern in this thesis is acting, but I need to examine concepts of theatre in order to elucidate their inherent concepts of acting.

I can take any empty space and call it a bare stage. A man walks across this empty space whilst someone else is watching him, and this is all that is needed for an act of theatre to be engaged.

(Brook, 1990, p.11)

In Brook's familiar description we assume that the man is the actor. Grotowski's aim to strip theatre down to the bare essentials, 'the fundamental encounter between actor and audience' (Neelands & Dobson, 2000b, p.138) found that only an actor in a space was necessary, with an audience watching (Grotowski, 1968). However, comfortingly familiar defining features have not gone unchallenged. Beckett sought to question the minimal preconditions for performance and 'embarked on a process of aesthetic reduction which culminated in his play *Breath*. *Breath* demonstrates how performance can do without the physical human performer and still constitute a performance' (Hilton, 1987). The piece was very short with a slowly rising curtain, a stage full of rubbish and a baby's cry. After less than a minute, the curtain fell with a dying man's sigh. If *Breath* was theatre, then it challenges Brooke's definition. Hilton identifies the pile of rubbish in the same way as he identifies an actor, as an actant. This is an act of designation. Hence, in *Breath*, the three

essentials for Hilton are present: space, time and actant. So, *Breath* pushes against the familiar definitions of theatre and the assumed role of the actors.

Such experiments to see if assumptions about acting can be dislodged continue. Wiltshire describes an extraordinary experience in New York which disrupts our concept of 'the actor, the paradigm of one who stands in for another' (Wiltshire, 1991, p.xiii). He went to see a theatre piece entitled, *Light Torch* at a warehouse near the docks. The audience were seated and the space darkened.

In the darkness the main door of the warehouse in the middle of the wall before us slowly rolled up and opened. It went from floor to ceiling and was large enough for trucks to enter and exit. Gossamer curtains on each side of the opening billowed softly in a light wind. As if surrounded by a nimbus of silence, the sounds of the city could be heard – mostly soft and distant in this area – and cars appeared occasionally, framed by the door, as they passed the street outside. Appeared, but appeared transfigured, as if a spell has been cast over them.

(Wiltshire, 1991, p.x)

Trucks reversed into the warehouse and deposited items, such as a sink and an apple, which became 'meaningful in a much more vivid and complete way than they would in ordinary use' (ibid. p. xi). A police car arrived and policemen got out and shone torches up at the audience who laughed a bit. The police seemingly embarrassed, left. Was this theatre? A space, an audience and people in the space, but those in the space were not party to the theatrical event. They were not conscious of their roles. They constituted actants from the point of view of the spectators and yet, what was observed was chance. It

was not prepared. The individual trucks and drivers had not been previously designated, but whatever happened to move into the space is inevitably interpreted. Wiltshire describes at length the experience he had.

We witness theatre experimenting on itself, discovering and underlining the conditions of its own possibility. Its value can be separated out as a factor in any theatre event. "That is actual things in plain view – not things dressed up or illuminated so as to appear to be what they are not – are nevertheless seen in an entirely new light". The difference, then, must come from a change in the interpretive attitude of the viewer, not from the things themselves.

(ibid. xii)

It is an intriguing concept. Watching life positioned as a member of an audience anticipating a theatre event. In this event, there was no one taking on the persona of another which is what we would generally expect from theatre. The actors were not what we think actors should be. Actors are assumed to be other than themselves in the theatrical context and as O'Neill explains, 'all acting is, by definition, unreal' (1994, p.38).

But there are some actors who are working to actually deny any imaginary context, or unreality in the theatre. Handke, for example, has experimented with the very conceptual limits of acting. His theatre involves "speakers" who deliver Handke's lines which have been rehearsed, but they appear as themselves in terms of such as clothes, hairstyles and voices. 'What the performers say are, almost entirely direct statements that would be true no matter who was speaking them. In *Offending the Audience* they speak about the

performance situation: "You are sitting in rows ... You are looking at us when we speak to you ... This is no mirage ... The possibilities of the theatre are not exploited here." (Kirby, 1996, p.57)

Handke employs actors to be 'speakers'. They use their own voices, clothes and expressions. Are they merely the instruments of the playwright, since they are not in an act of creation? David Mamet argues that the playwright has the responsibility to create a good play and his description of the actor's role is instrumental. 'The actor is onstage to communicate the play to the audience. That is the beginning and the end of his and her job. To do so the actor needs a strong voice, superb diction, a supple, well proportioned body and a rudimentary understanding of the play' (Mamet, 1997, p.9). Clearly, this contrasts with Stanislavski's system in which the actor is required to reach her own emotions. For Mamet the actor's emotions are both irrelevant and dangerous (p.10).

So actors can be irrelevant for Beckett; untrained, unknown and unaware of their role for Whitman; speaking in denial of a fiction for Handke; and for Mamet the actor's job is to 'show up, and use the lines and his or her will and common sense, to attempt to achieve a goal similar to that of the protagonist.' (1997, p.12). And here are just four examples of recent ideas. The massive range of systems of actor training through the twentieth century (Hodge, 2000) is further evidence, as is the current lack of conclusion in UK drama schools about what students should actually be trained to do (Neelands, 2001). The variations are acknowledged now, and seen as a positive in theatre. Yoshi Oida describes his experience of working with Peter Brook:

I realised that I was still performing in accordance with the principles of nōh theatre where the actor's concentration must be extremely intense. But popular theatre requires another approach. And I realised that just as there are many levels of performance, there is no one "right" way to act.

(1992, p.72)

John Harrop's book, *Acting* examines the problem of what it is that actors do (1992). He suggests that an actor is both an artist and an instrument. He sees the playwright writing for an instrument. Over the centuries, this instrument has not really changed (except men acting as women giving way to women acting women), but the way the instrument is used has changed repeatedly and radically. Harrop traces the changes in acting styles and conventions through the ages in British theatre and is interested in the idea of artistry and skill. He identifies contexts in which the actor expects to display her skills as a performer such as the commedia actor, an actor trained in Laban's system, and a contemporary actor in physical theatre. He contrasts this with acting conventions which require the actor to conceal any sign that he is working at the role. The realistic actor is trained to obscure signs of performance. Mamet says, 'I don't care to see a musician concentrating on what he or she feels while performing. Nor do I care to see an actor do so' (p.12). The degree to which specific skills are revealed depends to some degree upon the cultural context. Actors trained in kabuki theatre and kathakali, for example, will be trained in specific skills and techniques over years, and audiences will expect to see these exhibited in the performance.

Marvin Carlson identifies a context in which the distinction between the displaying or concealing of skills was crucial to an understanding of role as distinct from acting. A

couple are part of a living history project in Fort Ross in Northern Carolina. They dress in 1830s costumes to greet visitors in their roles as the last Russian commander and his wife. The wife played the piano at one stage to give an 'impression of contemporary cultural life, but later stopped this because she saw it as departing from her role in living history and moving her role into the category of performance. 'Ms Pritchard did not consider herself "performing" until she displayed the particular artistic skills needed to give a musical recital' (Carlson, 1998, p.3). Carlson suggests that despite her personal view, most visitors will assume that she is performing from the moment she first greets them as Elena Rotcheva.

This relates to a view of the self-effacing actor who sacrifices herself for the part, associated with the realist tradition of acting. It can be distinguished from the actor who is openly aware of the duality of the act. Harrop states the popular view that when Olivier played Othello the audience saw the great actor through the role. He argues that great actors reveal their virtuosity in their parts. Harrop distinguishes between the actor and the performer, 'The performer is both the actor and the character' (Harrop, 1992, p.74). Kirby explains that '...not all acting is performing'(1995, p.43). 'The performer however, never behaves as if he were anyone other than himself. He never represents elements of character. He never merely carries out certain actions.' (p.45)

If the performer does something to simulate, represent, impersonate, and so forth, he or she is acting. It does not matter what style is used or whether the action is part of a complete characterisation or informational presentation. No emotion needs to be involved. (p.46)

Hodge explains that ‘Performing does not have to include ‘acting’, in that performers can be themselves, and are not pretending or representing anybody else’ (1999, p.4). But Schechner highlights the contemporary flux and the difficulty of tight definitions of performance, just as we have seen regarding acting.

What is a “performance”? Where does it take place? Who are the participants? Not so long ago these were settled questions, but today such orthodox answers are unsatisfactory, misleading and limiting. “Performance” as a theoretical category and as a practice has expanded explosively. It now comprises a panoply of genres ranging from play, to popular entertainments, to theatre, dance and music, to secular and religious rituals, to “performance in everyday life”, to intercultural experiments and more.’ (Schechner, 1996, Editorial introduction).

Many writers on performance have suggested that performing has a consciousness to it (Blau, 1992, Carlson, 1996). For Hodge’s purposes, ‘performance’ was an appropriate term for stand-up comedians who are not exactly ‘acting’ yet are playing *consciously* to an audience. The distinction made between performing and acting is useful in consideration of the role of teacher and teacher-in-role. We could be deemed *performing* as teachers in the classroom, with a consciousness of ourselves as teachers and an awareness of our audience of children. We are not acting. In role, there is the ‘pretending or representing’ that Hodge identifies with acting.

It is in the context of these differences and distinctions between conceptualisations of acting that I approached the teacher-in-role work of John O’Toole and Cecily O’Neill in order to determine whether it could be categorised as acting behaviour. Michael Kirby’s

definition of acting is 'to feign, to simulate, to represent, to impersonate' (1995, p.43). Teachers in role represent a viewpoint or attitude, feign the voices of others, and often simulate familiar actions. Kirby's definition includes the minimalist acting required in *The Measures Taken* (1997), and the realistic acting necessary in *A Doll's House* (1993). Actors in Keith Johnstone's improvisational work, in Boal's forum theatre, and in street theatre are all encompassed in this definition. If we accept this definition then there is little debate to be had over whether or not teacher-in-role is acting. We are left only to consider what sort of acting teacher-in-role might be. However, this is a markedly inclusive definition that we may not wish to accept, even temporarily. A rapist who ingratiates himself to get into a potential victim's house is 'feigning' friendliness. Politicians represent particular viewpoints. In the wake of the 2001 general election in the United Kingdom we heard from defeated Conservative MPs who claimed to have disagreed with Hague's line on Europe as major election campaign policy, but represented that view to support the party. In Kirby's definition, they would be acting. This is not the aesthetic acting that Neelands describes above. Even as a temporary definition, we may have some problems with it. What is, however, clear is that the assumptions held in this definition speak of an acceptance and understanding of the broadest of acting practices.

In order to progress, given that language is slippery and concepts unstable, I wish to adopt Zarrilli's view of a definition being temporary. Through an exploration of concepts of theatre and acting, a broad range has emerged which challenges any fixed definition, and challenges the traditional western model as a benchmark. I have so far suggested a distinction between acting and playing a social role on the grounds that acting engages an aesthetic and usually has a fictional context.

CONTEXTS & AUDIENCE RELATIONSHIPS

The teacher-in-role and actor are operating in different contexts. The different contexts inevitably affect their relationships with the 'audience'. Given that contexts and audience relationships must influence what the teacher-in-role and actor do, it may seem to follow that they cannot possibly be *doing* the same thing. The Categorising Teacher-in-role and Actor grid above identifies many distinctions between the contexts and audience relationships which characterise the teacher-in-role and actor respectively. Let us look at these more closely to see if some of these distinctions can be broken down so that the gap between the two is reduced.

The teacher-in-role is working in an educational institution. The teacher is there to teach the children in her charge. The children cannot get up and walk away without a reaction from the teacher (Neelands, 1998, pp.15-17). The teacher must focus on not only performing a teacher-in-role but must also continue to play her role as a teacher since she is responsible for the class. The children are not there voluntarily, but compulsorily. This in turn has an effect on the relationship between the teacher-in-role and the audience. The teacher cannot choose to break the expectations of the audience in a major sense. Each teacher is guided by the profession's traditions of practice. Sets of expectations are passed on and the teacher socialised into them. The choices she has are limited by strong parameters. The children have an expectation that the teacher will teach them, that is the contract between them. Whether or not the children wish to keep their part of the contract, the teacher is obliged to keep hers. The context of the teacher-in-role is the classroom which for many children has associations of boredom. The teacher-in-role, then, often has to work against negative expectations. The children did not choose the content of the

lesson, but must sit through the lesson. The relationship between the content and the audience creates a different context, too. Children may be more willing to approach a drama on a subject they have enjoyed than one that has bored them. (Winston & Tandy, 1998, p.x). The children in class drama usually know one another. There is a hierarchy between the teacher and the children and an assumed process of knowledge or skills for acquiring it being imparted from the teacher to the children.

The actor is in a theatre. She is not responsible for the members of the audience in the way that the teacher is. The actor can focus fully on the performance with no supervisory concerns. The audience has a very different contract with the performer. Attendance is not compulsory. Audience members have volunteered to attend and have indeed, paid to do so. This places an economic contract between the actor and audience (Neelands, 1998, p.viii). The actor does not need to teach the audience, but the audience must not be bored. ‘Two things can lick a play. One is that the audience don’t believe it, and the other is that they don’t care’ (Howard Lindsey, cited in Willis & D’Arienzo, 1981). If they are bored they will leave and pass on negative comments about the play. Obviously, if this happens then the play may close early and the work will be over sooner than expected. Economics is therefore crucial to the actor-audience relationship. The actor wishes to be admired and to establish a good media image. This will promote her chances of securing high status future contracts. Audience members will have made a choice about the play or the actors in it, and there is an expectation that they will enjoy it. There is an assumption that the actor will give pleasure, but both sides know that the audience has the power to discomfort the actors if it chooses. Ultimately, the actor’s fate is in the hands of the audience although public dissatisfaction is rarely demonstrated live from an audience in theatre in the United Kingdom. The audiences, unlike those in the schoolroom, do not

know each other and often numbers are so large that they will not even see, let alone know who they are collectively.

Diverse contexts for teachers-in-role and actors

Like the grid created by the teachers distinguishing teacher-in-role and acting, the differences above suppose that the context for all teachers-in-role is the same and likewise for actors. However, this does not give the full picture. I observed David Booth teaching young children in an infant classroom; a very different context from Fiona Shaw's performance in a west end theatre, but, it was also very different from Cecily O'Neill's session in a Royal National Theatre rehearsal room with a teenaged youth theatre. At the same time, an actor employed in street theatre in Blackpool has a very different context from Fiona Shaw's. Each individual's context is different and determines audience relationships. Booth needed to maintain the role of 'teacher' with young children whereas, O'Neill could approach the youth theatre differently because the participants were there out of choice and were older. The street theatre performer must attract the attention of a possible audience of passers by, while Shaw's audience have committed to give her attention by buying a ticket for the play.

The features above which appear to distinguish the teacher-in-role and the actor not only assume one type of activity for each, but also assume that actors always work within the dominant Western theatre model. Comparisons with many other acting contexts point to less sharp distinctions. Let us look at some examples which break the strict oppositional formula of the grid set out earlier.

When *Waiting for Godot* was performed in a prison the audience could leave the performance space, but a different context was created because they were incarcerated in the prison (Esslin, 1974, p.19). So, here the actor’s audience was not forced to be at the performance, but their being compulsorily at the prison was significant to the theatrical event. Other theatre events in prisons also challenge a simplistic view of the actor’s work (Jackson). Actors work with small groups in prisons, where unlike mainstream theatres, the audience might know each other.

Boal’s forum theatre also challenges the easy divisions of the grid. The actor in Boal’s theatre will work in a very different context from that assumed by our initial grid distinguishing the actor and teacher-in-role.

	Boal’s forum theatre actor	Assumed context of actor (see initial grid)
Audience role	active participation	inactive participation
Audience relationships	familiar	unfamiliar
Audience size	small group	large group

In both traditional Western theatre and contemporary forum theatre workshops, there is an economic relationship between actor and audience, but this is not the case for all actors. Some actors provide the audience with free theatre, such as our actor in street theatre for holidaymakers in Blackpool. Here the actor may be paid not from profits from an audience, but by a body detached from the theatre experience, such as the council or tourist board. Hard and fast rules about the contexts and relationships with audiences cannot be made. There are many different forms of theatre that disrupt neat definitions and therefore destabilise simple conclusions about comparisons with teacher-in-role and acting.

Concepts of audience

I have used the word 'audience' very generally to include theatre audiences and children in the classroom. This goes against the published views of writers such as Morgan and Saxton who declare that 'The teacher must remember that the class is not her audience' (Morgan & Saxton, 1989, p.49). They mean that the teacher should not focus on her own performance, but concentrate on the learning potential. But at the heart of their concern is the assumption that an audience is, by definition, non- participant. They mean that the teacher should not be busy in front of the class, with the children just watching. Once the concept of an actively participating audience is conceptualised, then calling the children 'audience' is less problematic.

Gavin Bolton's more recent publication, *Acting in Classroom Drama* (1998) makes a comparison between Grotowski's desire for 'audience participation' and what Heathcote wants from children. Grotowski had tried to secure a direct participation of spectators and had put pressure on them to join in with the actors. Grotowski later reflected that this had failed because the audience had not arrived prepared to participate, whereas the actors had the advantage of foreknowledge. Bolton argues that

The comparison with Grotowski cannot be sustained, of course, when it is realised that Heathcote selected her cards according to her reading of the needs of the class and with a view to giving the pupils the confidence to play their own cards. Grotowski's actors compelled the spectators to join in the actors' play'
(1998, p.183)

Heathcote's approach is gradually to take the participants into the drama, while Grotowski's was to exert pressure. At the same time, Heathcote responded to her perception of the needs of her participating audience. In contrast to Morgan and Saxton's caution about the children not being an audience, Bolton assumes that they are a 'participating audience'. This illustrates an important shift. Between the two publications there has been a significant change in the conceptualisations of children's role that is significant to a consideration of teacher/actor relationships with audience.

Concepts of audience in drama in education

I will pause to consider this shift from an initial stage when the class was not seen as an audience, to a concept of children being a participatory audience and propose that there is another stage between them.

Drama in education has continually had to struggle for status at both school and statutory level. Its exclusion from the UK National Curriculum exemplified this. Part of drama's difficulty in gaining recognition was the fact that it was a new subject in terms of both curriculum time and public examinations. A new subject on the curriculum has always had low status. Theatre Studies Advanced level was not accepted by universities as an Advanced level that counted for Higher Education entry when I first started teaching in the mid 1980s. How then drama could assert its status was an important question. Drama practitioners wanted drama to be taken seriously. The subject had to be legitimised. It deserved a properly recognised place in children's education.

A small group of drama teachers influenced by Hornbrook (1989) felt the way forward was to change the practice of drama in schools, arguing that 'The audience, so neglected

by drama in education, is fundamental to dramatic art (1989, p.110) and there should be a greater emphasis on formal production. But the majority remained committed to their practice and unwilling to change it. They were, however, prepared to change the discourse when a conceptual shift was presented: to align drama in education with theatre (while maintaining contemporary practice) could be a possible way forward for drama's status. If drama could be seen as a theatre form, it might gain respectability and therefore access to more time in the school day. I suggest that in order to prove that drama in education is a theatre form it was necessary to identify in its practice the features that constitute or define theatre. One of these constituents, it is often argued, is an audience. An audience was seen to categorise theatre, so from a past position of an audience not being relevant to classroom drama (Morgan & Saxton, 1989, p.49), there was a move to conceptualise participants in drama in education as an audience to their own dramatic action (Neelands, 1990, Introduction). The children could be an audience to each other while taking part in the drama, drifting in and out of the action and critiquing it in their minds. There was a new articulation of the activity of classroom drama, therefore, introducing theatrical terms to practice that had been purged of any theatrical connection previously. The use of theatre terms has continued and has arguably been a positive move for drama in education's status, particularly perhaps, in the eyes of its own body of practitioners.

What is interesting for our purposes, is what this move says about perceptions of audience and theatre. Evidently, it embraces a view that an observing audience is a requirement of theatre. While the conceptualisation of drama in education as a theatre form represents a radical view of previous conceptualisations of drama in education, it initially tended to operate with a restricted view of theatre. The drive to identify an audience was an attempt

to connect drama in education with the western dominant theatre form in which an audience observes action. The logic of this move is understandable if, as I suggest, it was energised by a need for status - for the subject to be legitimised. A new subject seeing itself on the fringe would not wish to identify itself with other practices on the fringe. It needed to be identified with whatever would bring prestige and a degree of power. Interestingly, the form of theatre chosen as the paradigm of theatre was one which in other contexts has been lampooned by some of the theorists and practitioners as bourgeois. This paradox illustrates Foucault's view that it is almost impossible to get away from the discourse in which we are involved, and inevitable therefore, that we draw upon that which we may not approve. What is notable in this context is that drama in education did not claim its credentials by aligning itself to participatory theatre practices which at face value seem a more suitable case for comparison. However, the association came and the notion of children as 'participant audience' is the third stage in my conceptualisation of audience in drama in education (Neelands & Goode, 1995).

Interestingly, when another new theatre form seeks to explain and establish itself, it does not need to prove its credentials as theatre. It is our field that is peopled by those who are teachers first and artists second that need to justify our art. Interactive theatre explained here by someone who has trained actors is an example of a collaborative form that does not even consider the need to justify itself, yet it describes practice which is not dissimilar to much drama in education.

The interactive stage is an environment that encloses both audience, or 'guest', and actor alike. Each guest is, initially or as a matter of course, singularly or as a group, endowed with a role to play. The outcome of any scene may change completely depending upon the

actions or response of the guest. These actions or responses continually alter the unfolding drama. The guest, as co-creator, is as responsible for the outcome as the actor. (Izzo, G, (1998) *acting interactive theatre: a handbook*, Heineman, Portsmouth NH, preface)

The terminology is interesting. The term 'guest' rather than participant (member of audience) may be seen as a way of making the practice look new and unique. Regardless of the semantics, the practice provides yet another example of an actor's context which breaks the mould established in our grid.

It is evident that the simple and taken for granted contrasts between the contexts of the teacher-in-role and actor have been overblown. It is only through aligning theatre to a particular form of western theatre that such contrasts have any plausibility at all. Once other theatre forms are explored the contrasting contexts become much less clear-cut.

FUNCTIONS AND AIMS

I shall now explain my use of the terms *functions* and *aims* and challenge the use of the term *function* in the discourse of drama in education. I shall argue that references to the concept of the function of teacher-in-role have been used to distance the practice from acting. Comparisons will be drawn between the articulated functions and aims of teacher-in-role and of the actor. I also wish to identify the neglected parallels between the functions of teacher roles and the functions of theatrical roles.

I have placed *functions* and *aims* together since they are inter-related. However, I do wish to clarify their relationship. An *aim* is defined as seeking 'to attain or achieve...a purpose, a design, an object aimed at' (Oxford English Dictionary, 1990, p.24). A *function* is defined as 'a mode of action or activity by which a thing fulfils its purpose' (1990, p.477). The *aim* for the teacher-in-role is that which is to be achieved, such as a new insight into a familiar fairy story. The *function* of the teacher-in-role is the mode of action that will fulfil her *aim*. The teacher-in-role's purpose in this example would be to bring about a new insight into a familiar fairy story. The *aim* of the teacher-in-role is to achieve particular learning objectives; the *function* of the teacher-in-role is to do what must be done to ensure that these are achieved. I am referring, then, to the aim as the ends, and the function as the means to achieve those ends.

The literature of drama in education contains much about the *function* of the teacher-in-role and focuses upon enabling learning, and its pedagogic efficiency, 'to maximise the learning possibilities' (Kitson and Spiby, 1997, p.38). The *function* is frequently used to distinguish teacher-in-role from acting. Cecily O'Neill argues, for example, that

‘Teachers in role must never act in the sense that an actor may, because they have a different job to do, a separate function.’ (O’Neill, 1995, p.61) and that teacher-in-role ‘is defined by its function’ (ibid. p.78).

A challenge to *functionalism*

The comfortable use of the word ‘function’ in the discourse of drama in education should, I propose, no longer go unchallenged. The term, *function* asserts a scientific, almost automatic inevitability. The heart’s *function* is to beat, to pump blood around the body. The heart cannot *function* as anything else. It exists to fulfil its *function* of pumping blood. In this scientific model the word function takes on a non-negotiable meaning. The heart’s function could not be argued to be anything other than to pump blood around the body. There is a consensus about what the heart’s *function* is. There is however, no such consensus about what the teacher does or indeed should be doing. The term *function*, therefore may be masquerading as a consensus, where in fact there is none.

Within sociology, an analogy between social organism and the biological organism promoted a particular theoretical approach: functionalism. Durkheim, in providing the framework for a functionalist perspective of education, established a view that for society to operate effectively individuals must develop a sense of belonging to something wider than their immediate situation. (1964 [1895]). Education in this view provides the mechanism by which society’s norms and values are transmitted to children. Functionalists therefore see education as a crucial part of the socialisation process. What functionalists fail to take into account, however, is that there may be more than one set of values in society. A high level of consensus cannot actually be assumed. With its concentration on social order and value consensus, functionalism largely ignores the

existence of coercion and conflict in society. What is more, if the education system does transmit values, they may well be those of the ruling class or elite. It is arguably the case, therefore, that identifying something as a function, camouflages a value judgement.

There is in fact no consensus about the *function* of theatre and acting, as we shall see later in this section. Asked about the function of an actor, David Mamet might talk of delivering the lines written by the playwright. Asked the same question, Joan Littlewood might have talked of the responsibility of devising, of personal input and experience. To argue that the function of acting is such and such does imply what is inevitable and unchangeable. In fact, of course, both views would have been articulated from very different standpoints, and neither can claim an absolute authority. Equally, to say that education or working as teacher-in-role have *functions* assumes a particular consensual value system that asserts what the *function* should be. So a description of what *does* take place is seen as a description of what is thought *should* take place. Veiled behind an assumed consensus is a value-laden assertion.

As a result of the challenges we have seen which expose functionalism as controlling and value-laden, notions of *function* have been purged from most education discourses. However, it has remained in the discourse of drama in education. Below we will see that there is frequent reference to the *function* of teacher-in-role in the literature, and the assertion that it has a different function from that of the actor. The *function* of teacher-in-role appears to be basically to deliver the pedagogic purpose. In the light of what we know about functionalism, we might wonder whether there is an assumed set of values behind the use of the term. It may be the case that the term *function* gives a scientific gloss and thus credence to an assumed consensus.

In the light of this theoretical development, I should like to suggest three points. Firstly, that far from being an independent issue, *function*, as the term is used in drama in education, is in fact as value laden as the term *aims*, and is entirely bound up with the *aims*. Secondly, that there is no consensus among drama practitioners about the *function* of teacher-in-role. Thirdly, that the comparison between a so-called *function* of teacher-in-role to distinguish the activity from acting is misleading.

I have drawn upon dictionary definitions of aim and function that led to a notion of aims as what is sought to be achieved. The function was the means by which these aims would be reached. There is no challenge to a view that aims are created given particular value systems. The aims of the school curriculum are partly driven by the value system of the political party in power. An obvious example is the Conservatives' edict in section 27 outlawing any promotion of homosexual relationships. The school management team usually has some influence on aims of the learning experience of its children. There is also the teacher. Drama teachers openly debate the values behind the aims for their lessons. Whether they are worthy aims, contentious aims, racist aims or liberal aims are discussed. Recent examples include Peter O'Connor's challenge (nadie) to the aims of Brian Edmiston's lesson on Christopher Columbus (nadie journal). John O'Toole challenges the aims of many dramas for being obsessively politically correct (2001). So, we accept that our aims are value-laden and are comfortable discussing them. However, the word *function* has been used as though it is innocent of such influences. Yet, if a function serves to provide the means to an end, then it is as value-laden as the aims because it is delivering the aims. Ultimately, I wish to argue that there is no significant difference between aims and functions as the terms have been used in the discursive formation of drama in education. Both are driven by a specific value system.

My second point is that there is no consensus about the function of teacher-in-role. The use of the word *function* has assumed that there is a shared understanding of what that function is; a consensus. However, if function is tied to aims as I have suggested, then disputes over the values of aims confirm that there is no fixed, agreed notion of function. But let us examine a particular instance by way of example.

‘Three Looms Waiting’ was Heathcote’s drama famously filmed by the BBC’s Omnibus (1970). After the lesson, Heathcote was interviewed about her ideas and her perception of what had taken place. During the lesson the boys had been negotiating the location for their drama. Having established a London location, Heathcote asked where in London. A boy said, ‘Coventry’. Heathcote ignored the boy’s mistake that Coventry is in London and during the interview she justifies her decision to do so. It was irrelevant to what she, the teacher, wanted to achieve. Her aims had nothing to do with geography. Another teacher in a UK primary school, perhaps during an inspection, may make a different decision if a child had made the same mistake. She may stop the drama to explain, but more likely she would find a way within the drama, in role, to clarify the fact that Coventry is not in London. This teacher could also justify her decision. She knows what she wants to achieve. Presumably, both teachers would articulate the function of teacher-in-role differently. It can be seen to excite and liberate, on the one hand. It can, on the other, be seen as functioning to deliver the requirements of the national curriculum and is therefore bound by an assumption that misinformation should be corrected. It may not be deemed appropriate for a boy to leave the classroom talking about Coventry in London. It may, however, be deemed appropriate if the child had a positive learning experience beyond the geographical detail. In these contexts there is not a consensus about what the teacher-in-role should be doing.

Despite the implication of the use of the term *function* there is not a consensus about the *function* of teacher-in-role. At the heart of the process/curriculum debate that Neelands considers in his recent article (2000) is a lack of consensus about the aims and functions of teacher-in-role. It may not be a huge chasm, but inherent in these positions lie differences in assumptions concerning what drama should be doing and what the function is of the teacher-in-role. Heathcote's Omnibus lesson represents a process bias in which the aims are established through 'her reading of the needs of the class'. The *function* of the teacher-in-role is to ensure these aims are met. The example of the primary teacher above, represents the view of curriculum drama. The aims for her lessons are often those set by the curriculum designers. She may need to ensure that particular spellings or towns or historical events are learnt during the drama. If the aims for teachers are different, and since I have suggested that functions are inextricably bound up with aims, then the continued use of the term function may lead to an assumed consensus that is false.

My third point concerns the use of the term function to distance teacher-in-role from acting.

Rosenberg (1987) likens such role-play to teachers' inclinations to reveal their acting prowess or their subconscious desires to "hide away for a time behind another identity" (p.37). Other commentators have construed in-role teaching as acting or character portrayal (Kase-Polisini, 1989; McCaslin, 1990). These commentators tend to negate the pedagogical function which Heathcote initially intended (Taylor, 2000, p.104).

We have identified the difficulties of language to express meaning and of definition. Wittgenstein argues that to understand words we need to understand how people use

them. The *function* of teacher-in-role, as the word has been used in the discourse of drama in education, has been deemed to signify something other than the *function* of the actor. Having explored the veiled implications of the term, I can better understand why it has been used to create a distance between teacher-in-role and acting. The *function* has implied a purity that could not be part of the actor's role which is, after all, premised on a pretence. If the function is the means by which the aims are fulfilled then there is no real difference in the function of teacher-in-role and actor except in so far as the aims are different. The aims finally emerge as far more significant than the function.

Comparisons between teacher and actor functions and aims

When writing about role, drama in educationalists do focus on the function, explained here by Morgan and Saxton: 'The teacher's eye and ear must monitor what is going on, how time is passing and if the educational objectives are being met.' (1987, p.49). This is, of course, not unique to teachers-in-role. In some contexts actors, too, must monitor what is taking place, time passing and whether objectives are being met. In *Theatre in Education*, (Alcock, 1999,) for example, and some forms of *Theatre for Development* (Kerr, 1995) it is crucial for actors to ensure educational objectives are achieved, and in many traditional African theatre a sense of social instruction is paramount (Okpewho, 1990, Biodun, 1984). Again, the shortcomings of the oppositions set out in the simple grid above are heightened.

Similarities between the functions of teacher-in-role and actor

Both teacher-in-role and actor

- have the job of creating a fiction; function in the 'as if'

- interact with those with whom they share the space
- function as communicators employing external features in order to hint at internal concerns

These are significant similarities. Both create a context that is feigned, and behave as if that context was real. They interact with other participants in, or observing the fiction on both the level of locus (abstract) platea (concrete) (Counsell, 1996, p.163). Both use external features such as gestures and facial expressions to indicate intentions and motives. Despite these important similarities, distinctions have continually been drawn. I shall list the differences and then analyse each in turn to see if a broader concept of theatre makes the listed differences less significant.

Differences between the functions of teacher-in-role and actor

- The actor has a function to entertain, the teacher-in-role to instruct
- The actor functions to elicit applause
- The actor functions to follow a predetermined destiny in the performance
- The teacher-in-role has to take on many functions at the same time

The actor has a function to entertain, the teacher-in-role to instruct.

Please don't act! The teacher must remember that the class is not her audience. It is not you as performer or entertainer that is important, but the learning which your role can stimulate. (Morgan & Saxton, 1987, p.49)

I wish to challenge both points and argue that they cannot operate as clear-cut distinguishing features since teachers-in-role also need to entertain and actors often

associate their function with instruction. Getting a balance of entertainment and instruction is crucial in classroom drama as in many forms of theatre.

Geoff Gillham articulated the importance of this balance with his phrase 'play for kids and play for teacher, (Gillham, 1974,). The 'play for kids' represents the entertainment aspect and the 'play for teacher' is obviously the instruction. The teacher needs to generate the children's interest in the drama in order to keep them involved. The chance to carry out any teaching will evaporate if the children have lost interest. Theatre, too, must entertain to keep its audience's interest. In many theatre genres there is an intention to instruct; a desire for learning to take place, as we have seen. Theatre in education must educate and entertain. Brecht's familiar concept of theatre as a vehicle for teaching requires an entertainment function to keep the audience's attention and indeed, presence. (1986, [1957] pp.69-76). The increasingly popular theatre for health promotion and theatre for development will foreground this balance while planning their performances. (Ball, 2001)

Laura Savage's unpublished dissertation (2000) provides an interesting example of the need to entertain in theatre for effective teaching. She spent a summer working with a Christian Street Theatre in London. Her analysis refers constantly to the need to find the balance between entertainment and instruction. In this context it focussed upon how to communicate the gospel message in an entertaining way. On the street there was a real struggle to keep an audience. Passers-by have not chosen to see the piece; they have not paid money and therefore have no expectations. They are not sitting down, but standing and thus easily able to move on at any moment. The actors must constantly maintain a high degree of entertainment or the audience will wander off and thus fail to hear the

message. As a Christian, the student deviser/actor found the constant tension between the need to entertain and the need to teach the Christian message was fore-grounded throughout the project. The acting company clearly had a joint function. In the light of such examples, the distinction between teacher-in-role and actor on the grounds of instruction versus entertainment cannot really be maintained.

An actor functions to elicit applause.

This tacit invitation from the actor for approval from an audience is surely only residually part of TIR, (Bolton, 2001, Appendix 4)

Bolton cites expectation of applause as the defining feature of performance (1998, p.262). However, even this may be seen as no longer a feature to separate the teacher and actor. Modern installations, often with no specific ending, which continue as audiences move in and out, function as work in progress and therefore no applause is expected. Actors in forum theatre do not invite applause. I recall a GCSE drama group arguing with an assessor about why they had not come back for a 'curtain call' after their performance. They wanted the audience to be left with the message of world poverty and not with them as performers. They said the attention would be drawn to them rather than the charity boxes they had placed in the theatre space.

The teacher-in-role does not wish to attract applause, but it is not unknown to receive it. Bolton 'once had an embarrassing experience ... in which before an audience of teachers [he] addressed them in role thinking that [he] was successfully "drawing them in" to "*our play*" and they clapped!' (2001, p.1 Appendix 4) Neelands' definition of performing (1998a, p.9) points out that in the western tradition of theatre there is an assumption that

audience is separated from the performers, 'But performance can also mean a dramatic event that is shared among a group'. In these cases there may not be any anticipation of applause. On closer analysis of both teacher-in-role and actor, it becomes hard to maintain the view that a desire for applause will always distinguish the two.

The actor has a predetermined destiny in the performance.

In acting one is '*no longer free to shift around spontaneously*' (Morgan & Saxton, 1987 p.35)

This point is tied up with a view that the drama in education class does not follow a written script, but the actor's work does. Certainly, an actor playing Hamlet has a teleological function, a particular job to do in order to fulfil the tragedy. Although his destiny is determined to some extent by the script, there will also be a prepared plan according to the overall production decisions. However, if we look beyond the western traditional model of theatre, we find that the actor does not necessarily have a predetermined destiny in the performance, nor a written script. Improvised theatre (Izzo, 1998) and Boal's invisible theatre (1979) do not provide the actor with a complete destiny. Indeed, Roddy Maude-Roxby of the improvising company, Theatre Machine, writes, 'I think the most important moment in improvisation is when you don't know what will happen next' (cited in Frost & Yarrow, 1990, p.55). In Commedia actors know the overall direction of where they are going, but they must respond to the unpredictable comments from the audience and each other. Rudlin see the plays as 'self authored' (1994, p.1). The improvised theatre demands that the actors enter the performance space with mental agility and willingness to respond.

It seems to me that the best and most direct initiation into improvised comedy will be by watching children at play...children who play well, who know how to play, are models of verve, naturalness and invention. They are masters of improvisation (Copeau, 1990, [1916] p.155).

In these examples the actor, just like the teacher-in-role, can vary responses according to the impetus of the moment. The function does not require a prescribed script to be followed, but a creative and immediate response to what is given by fellow actors or audience.

The teacher-in-role has many functions.

The leader or teacher, working inside the creative process, may acquire some of the functions of the director, designer, stage manager and even audience, but because of the nature of the activity, will go beyond these purposes. The leader's primary tasks are those of managing the action, of operating the structure, and of functioning as a dramatist (O'Neill, 1995, p.64)

Whereas the actor functions purely to deliver the role, the teacher-in-role has many functions at one and the same time. I defined *function* as the means to fulfil aims. In order to do this, the teacher is required to take on a number of tasks normally associated with roles in the theatre. Neelands identifies a link between teacher-in-role and the 'joker' in Boal's 'forum theatre' (1998, p.66). This is interesting because the joker has a range of functions rather like a 'master of ceremonies'. He sets up the rules and moves between the audience and acting, supervising the change of actor. The joker is not an actor himself and is not '... tied down to an allegiance to performer, spectator, or any one interpretation

of events'. (Schutzman & Cohen-Cruz, 1994, p.237). The teacher moving in and out of role prepares what is to take place and facilitates the process like the joker. This comparison suggests that the teacher-in-role has a number of jobs, yet is held tightly to none of them. The functions of the teacher-in-role are associated with taking a role, but also being a teacher with an educational agenda. She must: be a listener; respond to what is offered; incorporate the ideas of the participants; keep an eye on the time; act as director of the drama; act as a playwright; participate in the action; represent a role or roles.

Immediately it is clear that there is overlap in these functions. In order to be responsive, the teacher will need to be a listener and in order to incorporate others' ideas, she must take part in the action. The list does imply considerable demands on the teacher, and constitutes considerably more than just acting.

In addition to the many functions concerned with being a teacher, many writers have sought to identify the function of the teacher-in-role with a particular role in theatre as we have seen above (Bolton, 1998, O'Neill, 1995). For the most part, the comparisons refer to roles in traditional mainstream theatre. The teacher-in-role is frequently aligned to the work of the theatre director. (O'Neill, 1995) Throughout his detailed account of acting in the classroom during the twentieth century, Bolton does not deviate from the conviction that the '...teacher-in-role's function is that of a dramatist' (Bolton, 1998, p.184), but not a dramatist outside the action; within it. What is meant by 'dramatist' is explained: 'As dramatist the teacher is dictating at both structural and thematic levels' (ibid. p.184) which is a job he notes Heathcote aims to pass on to the pupils when they are ready. By the term 'dramatist' Bolton seems to mean the dramaturgical function. The dramatist

comparison seems similar to O'Neill's identification of the teacher-in-role with the job of playwright (2000) who also has an eye to structural and thematic concerns. 'In twentieth century traditions of Western theatre, the responsibility for organising the theatrical sign-system has fallen to the director. Whilst the dramatist is the originator of the linguistic sign-system, the director nowadays has the control of the theatrical (as opposed to dramatic) shape and is faced with the task of organising the signifying systems' (Aston & Savona, 1991, p.100). John O'Toole has argued that the centre for drama for the British has traditionally been the dramatist, but elsewhere, such as Asia, and even in Europe, such as in Spain and France, the centre of drama has been the actor. (Interview: 2/8/01). These cultural inheritances will have affected the way drama in education has been described and most of the early writers in the field of drama in education developed their work in a British context. Arguably, the teacher-in-role does not fulfil the entire function of the dramatist/playwright because she only has a small degree of control over the linguistic sign system, since the participants contribute to the oral text. Similarly, she does not fulfil the full function of director since this, too, is shared between the teacher and the children. Boltons describes the way Heathcote shifts the directorial power to the children through a card analogy: 'Heathcote selected her cards according to her reading of the needs of the class and with a view to giving the pupils the confidence to play their own cards' (1998, p.183).

However, there are good reasons for ascribing the functions of the dramatist, director and playwright as the theatrical equivalents to the functions of the teacher-in-role. They all suggest a sense of 'behind the scenes', the enabling process, the setting up of things to enable the creativity of others. In the twenty first century, though, these concepts are slippery. The role of the director is seen in many different ways. Simon McBurney of

Theatre de Complicite's has a notion of directing that bears little resemblance to that of Sir Richard Eyre. [McBurney and Eyre, 1999]. Equally, actors view the work of directors differently from directors. Eyre, in his foreword to *In the Company of Actors*, writes, 'I was surprised – but saddened-to be reminded of the low esteem in which directors are held: most actors regard them as warily as they do the dentist' (Eyre, 1999, viii). I wonder how helpful it is to make a comparison between the teacher-in-role's function and that of the director, when there is no straightforward concept of 'director'. The same applies to the comparison with a playwright. In its traditional sense, this would be a very authoritative role. Mamet argues that the playwright sets down everything required for a production (Mamet, 1997). In our classes, we anticipate the pupils taking some part in the playwriting process. Other models of playwriting may be closer to what we do. The ensemble methods of Joint Stock (Ritchie, 1987,) and the approach of Joan Littlewood are well known examples of shared playwriting (Goorney, 1981). Many contemporary companies devise work themselves, as a company who all take part in the process and in the product, such as Frantic Assembly, DV8, and Peepolikus. Perhaps these concepts of playwriting are closer to what the teacher-in-role is doing in the classroom context. They share the process with the children and ultimately aim to minimize the power differentials between class and teacher, 'by working in role we, as teachers, are able to establish a pattern of relationships which enable negotiation, joint ownership and the sharing of power even if elsewhere the normative role of the teacher is a traditional one' (Carey, 1990). (This clearly illustrates the way in which function and aim merge. Both are inextricably tied in this description of what the teacher is able to and should achieve.) These processes engage the whole group rather than one individual, and thus it is difficult to pin the function of director and playwright entirely on the teacher-in-role. There is a shared ideology that ties teachers of drama in education and collaborative theatre workers

such as Joan Littlewood. Both are working in a deliberately democratised way. Both wish to share the creative processes and to give voice to participants. Both accept experiment as part of the theatrical journey and engage participants in that journey. The activity is led by a sense of the value of personal discovery and group articulation of those discoveries. Littlewood drew on popular art forms to create performance, so that singing and dancing were incorporated. She knew her audience in London's East End would be familiar with the old time music hall tradition, so it was exploited in performance. Similarly, drama teachers frequently draw on popular art forms, most commonly perhaps from television programmes including soap operas and documentaries. Littlewood's approach to directing is probably more comparable to a playwright function of teacher-in-role than the autocratic mode of directing more akin to contemporary West End production.

The actor in traditional western theatre working under such a director may have no other function than to perform a part. But again, we find that an actor may be required to fulfil many more functions if our concept of theatre is spatialised. By this I am referring to widening concepts of theatre. In *Commedia dell'arte*, all the company members know the storyline, but actors improvise within it, and must respond to whatever the audience give them. My memory of playing *Arlecchino*, the Harlequin, is of having to think on my feet quickly because the audience heckled throughout. In my comments to the audience, I had to bear in mind what had happened before, the other characters, and of course the general drift of the story line towards which we were all working. Tension was still required, secrets could not be given away, hints of agendas had to be given, but we could add no additional story lines that could not be fulfilled within the performance.

If we return to the functions of the teacher-in-role listed earlier, we find that each represent a dramaturgical function of the commedia actor. The table below charts each feature from the list, alongside the reason that it is equally important to the actor.

Features from the Teacher-In-Role functions list	Reasons why the functions are relevant to the Commedia actor
Be a listener	to hear audience's contributions
Respond to what is offered	to create the live exchange of the genre
Incorporate the ideas of the participants	to heighten the improvisation experience
Keep an eye on the time	since to spend too long at one time may have consequences for later in the performance
Act as director of the drama	orchestrate scenarios in the moment
Act as a playwright	since no complete script exists
Participate in the action	as a company member
Representing a role	as one of the familiar commedia characters

These lists illustrate the ways that both teacher-in-role and the commedia actor perform many identical functions at the same time. Each function ascribed to the teacher-in-role is also present for the commedia actor. There is very much a sense of Johnstone’s ‘playing in the moment’ (1981) in both dramatic forms. In the case of commedia, multiple functions of the actor are not dissimilar to the multiple functions of teacher-in-role.

Commedia dell ‘arte is not the only dramatic context in which an actor plays many roles. Direct connections between the teacher and actor’s creation of the plot function can be identified. The teacher-in-role has a skeleton plot framework in her mind. The flesh on the bones are the business of the participants. The analogy of a journey is often used to explain this approach. ‘If the drama lesson is conceived as a map, with a series of

reference points and alternative routes, the structure becomes more flexible and allows the children to make the choices that we've been talking about... We could see on the map where we wanted to get to, and it didn't matter how many diversions we had to take'(Kitson & Spiby, 1995, p.41) The route taken is altered according to the decisions the participants make, but the teacher ensures that somehow the destination is reached by the end so pedagogic intentions are fulfilled.³ The notion of a journey may seem rather Aristotelian in its plot dominance, but the journey may take turns and loops, so that there is opportunity for re-examination and investigation rather than just a superficial delivery of plot line. 'Who dunnit?' murder weekends operate in a similar fashion. The company has prepared certain moments that the participants will experience. These are the A to Bs of this theatre form. What takes place between the planned moments can vary according to what the participants offer. The actors need to keep the next stop (B or C) in their minds and guide the action accordingly. This echoes commedia practice described above. In a sense these actors can be described as dramatists or playwrights creating oral texts to keep the overall piece on track. Comparisons with such work have not been made in literature on drama in education due to the dominant assumption that actors work from written or literary texts. In fact, many theatre forms work with an oral text as the examples demonstrate. This reasserts the point that weight has been given to the literary aesthetic in the literature of drama in education, at the expense of the oral aesthetic which I suggest is far closer to the practice of drama in education (Neelands, 1998, p.viii-ix).

The functions of the roles

In the theatre, if you ask an actor what role he is playing, he is more likely to answer

³ There are some variations on the degree to which the teacher should adhere to particular aims rather than move with the interests of the class. The process versus curriculum debate is not, however, at the heart of the concerns of this thesis.

with the name, rather than the function, of the character ("Henry V" rather than the one in charge). In educational drama, what is important is the function of the role in both the dramatic interaction and in stimulating learning. (Morgan & Saxton, 1987, pp.41-42)

They go on to 'identify nine teaching roles and look at the advantages and disadvantages and the potential learning for students'. An example is 'Role:Authority. Status: high. Stance: Manipulator,' (ibid.p.42). Clipson-Boyles similarly considers the 'Functions of teachers in role' providing two parallel lists: 'Function of the Role' and '*Examples of Teacher's Role*'. An example of the former is 'To lead' and of the latter, '*In role as the lead investigator of a robbery*'. Here the distinction between the 'functions of teacher in role' and the roles functions are not made explicit. While some consideration has been given to role functions, what has not yet been considered is the function of the roles in relation to the extensive literature on the functions of theatrical roles. O'Neill provides a lengthy and insightful commentary on the functions of character in theatrical contexts, pointing out that 'characterisation depends on function' (1995, p.71), but does not relate these to the functions of the teacher-in-role's role or character.

Some aspects of the roles created will be covered under 'Approaches' in this section. There I will consider the degree to which a representation or 'full blooded' character is created. Here, we will look specifically at the functions of the roles. However, there is some connection between the two, since writers have taken the view that a teacher-in-role's role cannot be a character since it has a function. It is arguable, however, that all characters have functions. They serve the logic of the plot, the spirit of the mood or the play's theme. The character versus plot argument arising from Aristotle's poetics has

continued through the ages (Halliwell (ed), 1987). But whichever view is taken, the function of character is accepted. William Archer (1912, p.218) highlights the issue explaining that the character can appear to come first given that Romeo and Juliet's tragedy would not have occurred had Romeo not been the impetuous young man he was shown to be early in the play. In this example, the character functions to form the plot. Conversely, it could be argued that he was depicted as impetuous, since this would function to serve the plot's tragedy. Whether plot leads character or character leads plot, the character still serves a function .

The theories of Vladimir Propp define the common contemporary view of character as function since characters fulfil the plot. 'In respect of the application of semiotic methodology to character, an important legacy from the early structuralist and formalist approaches has been the concept of the functions of character. Most famous for beginning the work in this area is the formalist, Vladimir Propp who identified thirty-one functions of the fairy tale..' He explained that 'many functions logically join together into certain spheres. These spheres in toto correspond to their respective performers. They are spheres of action' (1968, p.79). Propp identified seven characters that either 'correspond exactly to the action, or a character changes its function through being involved in several spheres of action, or one sphere of action is carried out by several characters' (Aston & Savona, 1991, p.36).

1. Villain
2. Donor (provider)
3. Helper
4. Princess (a sought after person) and her father

5. Dispatcher
6. Hero
7. False hero

Propp had studied Russian folktales and forged the way for structuralists, such as Ubersfeld (1978) to identify functions with performance texts. The functions of characters in the performance texts of the drama class can be identified similarly. Drama in education can be deconstructed in the same way as we might deconstruct a play in order to discover how the roles have functioned in their development. I shall later seek to identify the role functions of the roles taken when I analyse the case studies.

Aston and Savona identify the function of character as governed by convention.

Given that plot, in Greek tragic drama, is constituted through the reordering of material received in the form of mythic narrative, it is apparent that character has attracted to itself a narrative function from the beginning of theatre, and that a repertoire of conventionalised operations governing the communication of information to the spectator has developed over time. (1991, p.44)

They then provide a list of eight of the main conventions they have identified in which the character delivers narrative to the spectators. I will draw attention to two. The first: 'Self-presentation. A character may introduce herself/himself at the start of the play, as does Oedipus in *Oedipus the King* (lines 7-9), and/or offer supplementary information as appropriate in the course of the action.' (ibid.). This describes the way that many teacher roles function in class drama. The Time Traveller in the *Romans in Britain* drama

(Ackroyd & Boulton, 2001, Appendix 1) functions precisely in this way. The fourth convention is 'Character as confidant(e). A further conventional method of communicating information is the provision of a minor character in whom a more important character may confide' (Aston & Savona, 1991, p.44). This describes the familiar teacher-in-role as meeting or congress convenor. They are go-between roles and therefore have access to information from someone more powerful, but their lack of power makes them accessible to the other characters/participants. The field of drama in education too, has produced lists to describe the possibilities for these go between roles. The role can function as an information giver, or an information seeker, a high or low status role, an intermediary or 'one of the gang' (Morgan & Saxton, 1987, pp.40-49, Kitson & Spiby, 1997, p.56).

Aston and Savona propose that 'The project of differentiating between the "character" (i.e. the constructed psychology) and the functions (structural, ideological, theatrical and so on) of character in drama must ultimately take account of the actor.' (1991, p.46). They highlight the actor's role as the main agent by which character is communicated, with a view that the actor is in role for two reasons: to communicate a character, and to serve a function - which could be pedagogic. Here, then, character and function are not set up as oppositions.

This returns us to the role-taker as well as the role. Examining functions and role functions has proved complex, but perhaps most complex is my concern that *function* has been used to masquerade as innocent, while in fact, it cannot be separated from an overall aim which by its nature, will be value-laden.

SKILLS

The extensive writing about the aims and functions of teacher-in-role has not been matched by work on the skills required to fulfil them. When it is argued that the teacher-in-role functions as dramatist, for example, we assume certain skills are implied. But while a general explanation about shaping the dramatic experience is offered, the appropriate skills are not explained. The skills involved in the process of creating teacher role have not been covered in the field's literature. Bolton has recently pointed out that 'no one appears to have gone thoroughly into teacher-in-role. Most of us have talked about its 'functions' but rarely go into its component skills.' (2001, Appendix 4).

O'Neill has created a list entitled, 'Teachers in process drama should see themselves as:' The list includes 'Artists, the teachers collaborating with their students, the co-artists.' (O'Neill, 1995 p.13). This gives a sense of a creative process, but does not identify specific skills. Margaret Burke (1995), constructing thirteen basic principles for the training of a drama teacher, lists some significant skills that are specific to the drama teacher. Skill 3, for example, is important to the drama process: 'Teachers must acquire the analytical skills which enable them to sift through what students' are saying to generate dramatic action.' (p.42) and Skill 5 'Teachers must have the knowledge of enough strategies in order to be able to frame their choice of activity effectively – and affectively.' (p.42). However, the thirteen skills make no reference to acting, use of voice, or gesturing. Burke speaks of the art of 'making significant' as what 'causes that which is set apart to resonate meaning beyond itself, beyond the obvious' (Burke, 1995 p.44), but not about how the articulation of a role is significant in achieving this. Nor is there any suggestion of the skills required to take a role. Neelands considers the roles, skills and

knowledge of the drama teacher in *Beginning Drama* (1998). Key skills are identified as questioning, contracting and structuring. Advice is given for using teacher-in-role:

Use teacher-in-role to initiate, model, guide and control the students' responses; build atmosphere; work as a storyteller within the story
(1998, p.66)

All of these points could apply to the teacher in her usual teaching context except the fact that the storyteller works 'within' the story. In usual circumstances of story telling the storyteller tells the story from outside, as a narrator. Inside the story, working in role in the drama, the teacher must communicate clearly to the participants. This is clearly a drama specific skill.

Arguably, the most significant article on drama and theatre in education practice is Dorothy Heathcote's 'Sign (and Portents?)' (1982, pp.18-28). In it she describes the strengths of the theatre in education actor and then explains that 'a teacher by her *inability* to strongly sign on clothing, setting and accuracy of properties, can sign mainly in the language and body position areas, and these are more easily shed than the clothing and prop signs of the TiE actor' (ibid.) This implies that the teacher-in-role is using the skills of the actor, but without the many extras that the theatre in education actor can employ. The signing is significant for both. This can be seen to imply that the teacher is acting, but without such a strong ability to 'sign strongly' in certain respects.

Signalling the attitudes and intentions of the role clearly is the most important thing a drama teacher does when she is working in role....Voice, language, gesture and bearing

which are appropriate to the drama, the role and the learning, must be carefully chosen and maintained.’

(Morgan & Saxton, 1987, p.62)

The skill to use ‘voice, language, gesture and bearing’ are necessary for the teacher using role. Also necessary, therefore, is an understanding of which particular gestures are required at which precise moment. As in theatre the ‘process of signification is directed and controlled’ (Aston & Savona, 1991, p.99) so that the children are able to interpret what they see and hear. Bolton explores the notion of children ‘reading’ what is provided for them by the teacher-in-role. He provides an example of a lesson in which Heathcote played a few different roles to which the children responded differently. They were responding to what they ‘read’ in her roles and in turn, of course, she responded to what she ‘read’ in their responses. Bolton refers to the teacher’s function as ‘a dramatist who not only is supplying the words but also the accompanying non-verbal signals, so that the ‘reading’ required of the pupils is multi-dimensional’ (Bolton, 1998, p.184).

‘The concept of ‘reading’ the actor has its origins in theatre semiotics’ (Watson, 1995), so by ‘multidimensional’, Bolton is referring to the systems which communicate meaning beyond the spoken word. Certainly Glyn Wickham has repeatedly claimed that only 40% of the communication of theatre is through the dialogue, and 60% is through the various other aspects of the signing system such as voice, gesture, space, lighting and set. (Wickham, 1967) The teacher may not have so many aspects of communication available, but this does not imply a distinction between teacher-in-role and actor. In many performance contexts, not all these aspects, such as lighting and set, are the business of the actor. The actor’s responsibilities may be confined to her acting. However, in many

small contemporary companies, with the increasing prevalence of “collaborative theatre”, the actors are sharing the responsibility for all aspects of the production, so there will be no particular director or lighting designer. Similarly, the teacher takes on responsibilities for all aspects of her drama.

It is clear from Bolton’s description above that the teacher needs to be aware of how non-verbal signals are used. These non-verbal signing skills are not distinct to teachers. Let us look at what Styan says a propos acting:

Dramatic meaning cannot lie in words alone, but in voices and the tone of voices, in the pace of speaking and the silences between the gesture and expression of the actor, physical distinctions between him and others.

(Styan, 1975, p.26)

Bolton explains that children in Heathcote’s classes are asked to look for implications, motivations and assess consequences. The way they identify implications, motivations and assess consequences is by noting the way she looks at them, her tone of voice and her gestures. As Bolton has pointed out, they look beyond the words. They do what my undergraduate drama specialist students do when analysing an actor’s performance. These students are asked to look for clues in just the same way

The most common case of the subject in the drama is the ‘figure of the actor’. The figure of the actor is the dynamic unity of an entire set of signs, the carrier of which may be the actor’s body, voice, movements,

(Veltrusky, 1964, p.84)

The audience decodes; they interpret what is encoded in the actor. (Watson, 1995) To understand both the teacher-in-role and the actor the child participants or audience are expected to decode the figure of the actor. But even though we have seen that this is a process undergone between the teacher and children, as between the actor and audience, there remains a persistent reluctance to equate teacher-in-role in acting. When Howell and Heath explain that the teacher does not need to be a good actor because 'teacher-in-role is not about acting in the external sense of putting on a costume and finding a voice and a set of mannerisms for a character' the implication is of course, that acting is. The skills required are different, we are told, because the teacher role is 'concerned with enabling the children to enter the drama' (2001, p.47). Whilst voice and mannerisms are not required for role, the writers suggest that teachers need not be afraid of role since they are giving 'performances' in the classroom anyway as teachers. As teachers 'we modify the way we speak, our facial expressions and body language, we deliver "our dialogue" ... we often withhold what we know, in order to create an effect. Under these circumstances we are playing the part of a teacher – we are acting the role' (p.47). This is fascinating in that it suggests that there is more acting behaviour involved in being a teacher in the classroom than there is in being a teacher-in-role. We change our voice and gesture as teachers in normal classroom practice, but we do not need to do so when we take a role in the dramatic fiction. The skills required for the role of teacher, then, are those which can produce altered behaviour. The skills for role are those required to enable children to enter the drama, but do *not* require costume, voice or mannerism changes. This may be explained by the authority of the field's literature that continues to distance teacher-in-role and acting as we have seen. The fact is that actors are not always required to use costume and change their voices and adopt special mannerisms. Indeed, Grotowski

sought a theatre that was stripped of costume, make-up and everything beyond the actor audience relationship. He describes the exciting discovery that theatre could exist without all these things; it was the actor audience relationship that was crucial. (1968, p.12). It is thus the skills in developing this relationship that are significant to the actor. The same could be said of the teacher-in-role.

Chris Lawrence describes using 'the vocabulary of drama – such as gesture, eye contact, use of symbols and space' in a role he took during a lesson taught by Heathcote (1982, p.4). He wore a costume for Albert, the tramp and explains the choice of articles of clothing in the same way as a costume designer would for an actor's costume. It operated in a symbolic, as well as literal level. The connection is not made between the actor and teacher-in-role, but the costuming reminds us of the overlap. Ian Spiby makes a direct, explicit connection between the actor and the teacher-in-role. It may not be coincidence that Spiby has spent most of his career on drama, as opposed to drama in education. His writing is striking for its theatrical connections, being significantly different from even his co writer in *Drama 7-11* (1997). Under the heading of 'Signing the role' he explains that when taking a teacher role 'one of the most important points to consider is *signing* ... we give clues about the role we are presenting' (p.58). He makes a comparison with signals we give in everyday life through 'what we wear, what we say, how we move, what we do, the tone of our voice, the words that we speak.' (p.59). So far this is similar to what Bolton, Morgan and Saxton and Brian Heap have said, but Spiby goes on to point out that 'Actors with many years experience will use all of these signals to convey the role that they are playing. As a teacher it would be difficult to emulate this fully but what we are able to do is utilise some of these skills to improve our in-role characterisation' (p.59). Here what a teacher does in role is associated with what an actor does in role. It

also explicitly explains that teacher-in-role requires some skills which are the actor's skills. It does not invite the fears of teachers, however, since it invites us to expect to do just a few things like the actor, and not everything.

If we take the notion of costume we can imagine how a theatre designer might wish to create, for example, a tramp – the hat, the old clothes, the matted hair and missing teeth, the bag of possessions and the general look of neglect. As teachers we can't reproduce this effect. We have neither the time nor the resources. But what we can do is 'sign' a tramp. That is, we are able to choose certain things that give off some signals that indicate 'trampness'. We might for instance choose an old coat to indicate the raggedness of the character. An old hat might be used and perhaps a pair of old woollen gloves. The tramp might also be carrying a bag or a small bundle containing some possessions. He or she might shuffle than walk so an old pair of boots might be worn. The voice might be unclear and the tramp might be rather brusque and reluctant to talk. (p.59)

What is slightly different here is that many points are offered but nothing is particularly required. A teacher may be happy to wear a hat, but those who feel self-conscious could pick up on the idea of a bag instead. Some teachers may not want to walk strangely, but could happily mumble. Here, our attention is drawn directly to the connections between the actor's behaviour and the teacher-in-role. Having made the connection we are invited to take the aspects that we would feel comfortable with. Spiby does imply that the skills of the actor would be an advantage, but otherwise important is an understanding of the simpler possibilities that could be effectively used in isolation. A significant skill, therefore, may be the selection of what could support the drama, such as a particular voice, a prop or item of costume, as well as the skills in carrying them off in role. Spiby is

clearly influenced by Heathcote's earlier article (1982) which brings acting and teacher-in-role together.

Even here, however, where the skills of the actor are shown as desirable for the teacher-in-role, the teacher-in-role is not explicitly described as acting. What emerges from surveying the literature, is that although it is not 'acting', the teacher-in-role, like the actor, is signing. In most cases, though, the signing system is compared to that which we use in everyday life, rather than the sign system of theatre. This could be due to a reluctance to make teachers feel inadequate for teacher-in-role, or due to the unchallenged conventional assumptions that acting is something quite different. There are hints, however, that it is theatre signing that is significant. Burke's 'making significant' (1995) is consciously or unconsciously a connection with theatre signing more than everyday life signing. It alludes to the distinction between actions in life and the way they are constructed in theatre, selectively, with contrasts, an awareness of the symbolic, the effect of juxtaposition, rhythm and pace. Heathcote's deconstructions suggest that the skills required in signing for a teacher-in-role may not be radically different from those of the actor, but probably used to a lesser degree. The degree to which Heathcote aligns the skills of the actor in theatre in education and the teacher-in-role seems to have enjoyed very little influence, despite the significance of the article, which quickly became essential reading for student teachers. This might possibly be explained by an assumption that the actor in theatre in education is not doing what a 'proper' actor does. This view would enable a distance to be maintained between 'real' acting and the teacher-in-role.

Seeking a similar profile of what are seen to be the skills necessary for acting in professional theatre, I turned to the National Council for Drama Training's document,

‘Criteria and Procedures for Accreditation of Courses’ (November, 1999). It provides ‘criteria, listing technical skills and creative abilities’ that visiting panel will use in making a judgment about a course’ (7.3). Courses are assessed in the ‘core skills of Acting, Voice and Movement’ (7.31). It is interesting that voice and movement are separated from acting since use of voice and movement will be part of what enables a student to achieve the acting criteria such as, ‘show evidence of the skills of characterisation’. The document does not explain the skills of characterisation, but these criteria have been drawn up to facilitate assessment rather than facilitate enquiry into the nature of performance. However, this list which accreditation panels will use to ‘look for evidence that student actors are being offered learning experiences, appropriate to their years of study’ (7.33), which will enable them to achieve particular core skills in acting, is of interest to me because it lists what the council believe to be ‘core skills of Acting’ (7.32). When I first glanced at the list, I could not see much that suggested greater closeness between teacher-in-role and acting, but on closer examination I was able to make a range of tentative suggestions about the significance of many skills for teacher-in-role, which would be reconsidered in the light of the case studies.

7.33 ACTING: In assessing the quality of work in Acting, Accreditation Panels and Monitors will look for evidence that student actors are being offered learning experiences, appropriate to their year of study, which will enable them to:

- a) develop and play a character in rehearsals and performances and sustain it before an audience within the framework of a production as directed*

The teacher requires these skills to maintain a role within the framework of the dramatic encounter. In a processual developing model, each lesson may be seen as a role rehearsed for the next time the drama is taught

b) show evidence of the skills of characterisation

To role play Marcus and Suzie these skills were required

c) create believable character and emotion appropriate to the demands of the text and production

if the children did not believe in the character of Suzie and her fear, the drama could not proceed

d) define the objectives of a character and embody and express these within the context of a production

teachers define the objectives of their roles as 'functions' as we have seen above

e) make full use of individuality of performance

skills of individuality of performance may not be required in teacher-in-role

f) work sensitively with other actors in rehearsal and performance

such skills are required for the teacher-in-role to work with the participants

g) show evidence within performance of creative imagination, emotion, thought, concentration and energy

Teachers-in-role require skills of concentration and energy, but are not required to 'show' them

h) develop an effective working process and the ability to monitor and evaluate its application

Monitoring and evaluation are crucial to teacher-in-role

i) draw upon and make use of personal experience and observation to assist in the creation of role

This may be an inevitability rather than a skill, since teacher roles are created from what we know from life and from previous drama experience

j) prepare and sustain the quality of concentration necessary for each performance

A key skill for teacher-in-role

k) combine acting with singing and/or dancing and other appropriate skills within a performance

Probably not a required skill

l) use make-up, costumes and props effectively to develop performance

Skills with props are useful which may involve the way they are handled to give particular significance to them (Ackroyd, 1998, p.69)

m) communicate to an audience with expression, emotion and spontaneity

Skills of spontaneity are essential

n) adjust to the demands of different venues and media

Skills employed by teachers teaching in lunch halls and open plan classrooms. Media perhaps, less relevant

o) adjust to the nature and reaction of different audiences

Essential skills for teacher-in-role

p) read and interpret texts, research and observation in the development of a role

Certainly teacher roles often need research, but it usually focuses upon the subject matter rather than a particular role. Many teachers do take roles of particular characters which would need specific research, such as Morgan & Saxton's example of Claudius speaking to the court about Hamlet (1987, p.64)

q) identify style and form of writing in order to reveal and express these elements within a performance

Probably not usually relevant

r) use textual analysis, research and observation in the development of a role

Similar to p)

s) study text, in both prose and verse, and make full use of the structures and phrasing in order to reveal character, intention and the development of a story

In role of King Lear the text was studied to enable the speech to draw upon the Shakespearean language (Ackroyd, (1998, pp.35-36). Skills to study text are relevant when approaching story books for dramas.

- t) create and sustain an improvised rehearsal or performance if required with discipline and spontaneity*

Skills for creating and sustaining are crucial for the teacher-in-role

- u) show evidence of ability to devise and where appropriate, to direct, performance material from research and observation*

We have seen above that writers identify the skills of devising and directing in teacher-in-role

A list for training actors in noh theatre or kathakali would, of course, look very different. This list is a product of its own culture. It is born of the dominant tradition that I have suggested is the view of theatre that has been held in drama in education. I have suggested that broadening a view of theatre and acting will identify closer relationships with teacher-in-role. However, even in this list, there are some points that have been identified in the literature of drama in education as important skills for teacher-in-role. Indeed, Morgan and Saxton provide a range of 'skill building exercises for teachers' which include the development of skills in role perception, signalling skills and flexibility in the use of role (1987, pp.63-66) It provides us with a framework through which to explore the practice observed in the case studies.

APPROACHES

We have seen that the exponents of drama in education have implicitly and explicitly generated distinctions between approaches to taking teacher roles and acting. The most commonly expressed published view is that acting is about characters and teacher-in-role is not. (O'Neill, 2000, Morgan & Saxton, 1987) Teacher-in-role is deemed to be about 'representation' and this is often used to distinguish it from acting, as we will see below. These two points are intertwined, since there is an implication that representation does not involve the creation of characters. Equally, implicit is a view that acting is not representation: representation is the domain of teacher-in-role while becoming characters is the domain of acting. I wish to look closely at these different approaches and views, consider how representation and presentation might be distinguished, and challenge notions of character. Again, I wish to suggest that notions of tight boundaries separating concepts are in fact unsustainable.

Internal and external considerations

Morgan and Saxton advise that in approaching role a teacher is 'simply required to represent an attitude or point of view' (Morgan & Saxton, 1989, p.49). This is clearly distinguishable from their approach to student acting which involves 'communicating the inner life of the character' (1987, p.34). This supposes that a teacher's role should not communicate an inner life. Acting is distinguished from teacher-in-role by what we might call *internal* considerations. Bolton bases much of his work on acting behaviour on Kempe's definition that 'real acting' is 'to do with developing a character' (Bolton, 1998, p.195). Kempe defines acting as '... not only adopting someone else's attitudes and beliefs as in role play, but developing a sense of their character by altering the way you

‘speak and move’ (1990, p.178). Here the implicit distinction between role and acting focuses upon, what I shall call, *external* considerations. So character is identified with acting, and we see acting associated with both *internal* (Morgan and Saxton) and *external* (Kempe) features. Role play appears to require neither inner life nor altered gestures.

There are problems with both of these views of acting. Firstly, acting is not always concerned with the inner life of the character. The Agitators in Brecht’s *The Measures Taken* (1992, in *The Measures Taken and other Lehrstucke*, Methuen) do not require an inner life to be communicated, nor do many commedia characters. Secondly, all actors altering the way they speak and move when they act is perhaps a rather simplistic notion. It may also lead to simplistic notions as to what this alteration consists of, given that changes in pitch and expression might be very subtle. The unchanging voices and movements of many film actors evidence this. Sharon Stone and Nicholas Cage play different characters but we do not see the sort of *external* changes that Kempe describes. Actors may change their voices sometimes for obvious reasons, such as the American actress playing Brigid Jones who is an English character. But often it is the way expression, pitch, tone and speed of language in particular contexts that contributes to our impression of the character being depicted. Voices and walks do not have to change. I have not seen Judi Dench or John Thaw ‘walk’ differently in different parts but when Kathryn Hunter played Lear she had a very distinctive walk as did Maggie Smith when she played the Lady in the Van. Whilst different walks may be used, they are not essentials and therefore are not a defining feature of acting.

There is the further question of whether these points of inner life and external changes are relevant to the drama teacher-in-role or not. As the mother of an American soldier in the

civil war in a drama I taught with Jonathan Neelands in Toronto (1994), the gaps I left between words, the fixed gazes in response to questions the children put to me, and my sighs and gestures all were designed to convey the inner life of the role. The inner life of Jo Boulton's lonely dragon is not only revealed to the children, but becomes the focus of her drama accompanying a story book (2001). The claim that an inner life is essential for an actor, and that it has no place with a teacher role emerges as untenable. When I played the frightened Suzie (2001, Appendix 5) I moved differently because I wanted to signal my shyness. I therefore moved with a sideways step, with hunched shoulders and quickly moving eyes. My voice was quieter than my own usual voice, and lighter to portray someone very young. I have seen Jonathan Neelands teach in role in high and low status roles and have heard his voice change. A strong, flat voice as the Recruiting Sergeant (Mobbs' Boys, 1985) creates a distance between the children's roles and the high status character. As one of the troops he dropped some consonants and softened his pitch to identify his role as one alongside the students' roles. Bolton explains how Heathcote altered her voice, '[she] often resorted to thickening her accent, using slang even swearing (mildly!). In America her voice would often become Americanised. We used to assume this was aimed at authenticity within the fiction but I now believe it much more served 'bonding as a preparation for creativity' (Bolton 2001 - letter-). Whatever her reasons, Heathcote changed her voice. I must conclude that voice and movement changes are not essential for the actor, but nor are any irrelevant to the teacher-in-role.

Representation and Presentation

Morgan and Saxton identify role play as '... the first stage in the transfer from identification as self to identification as performer' (Morgan & Saxton, 1987, p32). In order to clarify this stage for the teacher they have constructed a list under the heading

‘Representing’ that I quote in full below. They refer to an example of Lister from a drama described in *Dorothy Heathcote: Collected Writings on Education and Drama* (O’Neill (ed)1984, pp.126-137).

‘Select those signals you will use to represent the role to your students:

Consider language: heightened and formalised for Lister.

Consider costume: sleeves rolled up.

Consider props: drying your hands on a towel...

Consider space: a formal set-up with a table.

Consider light: the table will be placed by the window.

As you and your students become more confident in working imaginatively, physical representation may become less necessary as they (and you) grow more capable of working symbolically.’

(Morgan and Saxton, 1987, p.62)

If representation is what teachers do in role, and this is the approach to representation, then this description should describe something distinctly different from the approach of an actor. In order to discover how ‘representing’ is something other than a form of acting, I asked actor Simon Callow to have a look at the list above. I tailored the points a little to avoid the use of the words student and teacher. My question was: ‘Do you think there is anything missing in this list of notes for an actor?’ He read the list and explained that costume and space are not always relevant and confirmed that language is crucial (Appendix 2). This is interesting because as we saw in the literature highlighted under Skills, the same issues arise for teachers-in-role. So thus far, rather than heighten a distinction between the actor and teacher-in-role through identifying teacher-in-role as

representation, there seems to be significant overlap. Callow thought that the list described what an actor does appropriately. He could not think of anything that should be added to the list for an actor. So if we conclude that the list does indeed describe what teachers do in role, then in fact, teachers in role do the same as Callow thinks he does as an actor. Callow's final comment on the list is fascinating. He thought that the list is useful because 'it doesn't pretend that acting is just a representation of reality' (2000). Callow is an actor in the western tradition, and his response may be different from that of an actor in the kathakali tradition.

The terms *representation* and *presentation* are often used very loosely, and perhaps misleadingly. In Beckerman's *Theatrical Presentation: Performer, Audience and Act* we find a description of the traditional distinction between presentational style and representational style. 'This distinction suggests that one form of theatre involves direct communication with the audience while the other does not'(1990, pp.110-111). The nub is the relationship between the actor, her role and her audience. Julian Hilton breaks down the dialectic held in the actor as performer and character at the same time. He explains that if we do not find an actor convincing in a role, we will find the experience as audience pointless, and at the same time, if we were entirely convinced that the actor was say, Caesar, then we would warn him of impending dangers. Hilton argues that the actor 'must accomplish the sophisticated feat of both being Caesar and merely representing him at one and the same time' (1987, p.33). We must assume that by 'merely representing' he means that the actor is somehow distanced from the part since it is set in opposition to 'being' the character. Hilton appears to be making 'being Caesar' as the time that the audience may actually assume the actor is Caesar and 'merely representing' when he reveals his position as actor at the same time as being Caesar. This may lead to some

confusion since ‘representational theatre’ is usually associated with a method of acting that brings the actor and character close together.

Neelands suggests that teacher-in-role in the approach to drama-in-education known as ‘process drama’⁴ is an example of representational theatre (2000a) which he associates with the realist tradition. So maybe the Morgan and Saxton suggestion of representing in teacher role is in the style of a Stanislavskian approach. However, there is clearly something in the list that brought Callow to a very different conclusion. He liked the list because ‘it doesn’t pretend that acting is just a representation of reality’ (2000). He clearly understood something of the presentational style here, the establishing of an awareness of the actor as role and player at the same time. The opening sentence is significant: ‘Select those signals you will use to represent the role to your students’. It does not sound like a preparation for a role according to the system of Stanislavski. The directions to teachers focus on the external. We must remember that Morgan and Saxton distinguished this activity from acting because it was not concerned with the ‘inner life’. Perhaps then, the distinction they are actually making is not between acting and ‘representing’, but between two styles of acting. It is noteworthy that they write that ‘physical representation may become less necessary’ and there is an aim to work ‘symbolically’. Again, this sounds like advice to produce a more distanced role than a preparation for the role-taker to become immersed in the character in the way familiar to the realist acting tradition. While representation is often associated with realistic theatre and therefore the acting style of Stanislavski (Neelands, 2000a, p. 38-39, Neelands & Dobson, 2000b, p.63), Morgan and Saxton seem to be describing something different.

⁴ An explanation of the term ‘process drama’ is provided in the introduction to *Drama Worlds* by Cecily O’Neill.

I suggest we need to pause to look at what is emerging. Morgan and Saxton made a list they describe as 'representing'. They say this is not acting. I have suggested that it constitutes a different sort of acting to what they describe as 'acting'. Their assumptions behind the distinction appear to be the now familiar ones. Acting is identified with the realist mode of acting. What they describe for teacher-in-role looks (even to Callow) like acting, but a different mode of acting, that we would associate with presentational style according to Beckerman's definition. We probably need to make a distinction between 'representing' which for Morgan and Saxton and Hilton assumes a distance from the role, and 'representational' which is the mode of theatre we associate with realistic, life-like portrayal. It will be important to consider the types of role portrayal in the case studies to see if we can categorise teacher-in-role as one particular style of acting as Neelands has suggested: representational as opposed to presentational (2000a). We have looked at what Morgan and Saxton propose teachers should do in role which appears to be non-realistic acting, although it is described as 'not acting'.

Perhaps it is reductive to maintain that we will be able to identify teacher-in-role as one of two positions, representation or presentation. I have suggested that what Morgan and Saxton describe does not fulfil representational criteria as they are generally understood. This may lead to the assumption that it is presentational. But, this opposition between representational and presentational theatre modes is not the only way to consider approaches to acting. I wish to cite three examples of other approaches which may help us here, and when it comes to understanding the practice of the case studies. We will first return to Beckerman.

Beckerman's model: direct and indirect presentation

This distinction suggests that one form of theatre involves direct communication with the audience while the other does not. It is here, in discussing representational style, that critics tend to isolate drama from the performing process, denying the fact that in a true sense, all drama is presentational. Even the most introverted, self-contained scene is intended for performance, and to the degree that it is prepared and an audience brought to witness it, it is a work of presentation (1990, pp.110-111).

Beckerman proposes an alternative model for looking at the relationship between actor, role and audience. He suggests we consider direct and indirect forms of presentation.

In direct presentation 'The performer acknowledges the presence of the audience and presents the show making that acknowledgement explicit. This type of playing differs from the *indirect* form of presentation where the performer supposedly does not "admit" the presence of an audience and acts as though the activity performed has an autonomous existence' (1990, p.111) In contrast,

Direct presentation, ... is an open exchange between performer and spectator. But drama, by its very definition, has a double nature. In performing drama, the actor assumes an identity, plays a fictional role, or does both. There is thus the actor and the act which are fundamentally at odds with each other. The result, for direct presentation, is that openness of a dramatic actor is a sham. It is another illusion, but an illusion that proclaims it is what it appears to be. (ibid.)

Beckerman argues that there 'is no razor sharp separation between direct and indirect presentation. All sorts of modifications of both types appear' (1990, p.111). He talks of prologues and monologues which are direct addresses to the audience that have been used as conventions or as frames for a production throughout theatre history. Interestingly, he cites Tom Wingwood's narration in *The Glass Menagerie* as an example of the latter, interesting because the plays of Williams are often categorised as realist. This is not surprising with their sense of the removal of the fourth wall, and painstaking notes on the set and details of particular movements of gestures that should be created in performance reminiscent of naturalists such as Ibsen and early Strindberg. [Footnote 5 Zola outlines the principles of naturalism in the preface to *Therese Raquin*.] However, Williams' initial plan included special effects to create 'non- realistic projections' (1977, Synopsis of scenes), and the play is framed by Tom Wingwood's narration to the audience. He sets scenes for us and therefore focuses the way we, the audience, will experience them. 'His narration is an exorcism for abandoning his mother and sister...In a sense he is a ringmaster or master of ceremonies' (Beckerman, 1990, p.123). The example serves to illustrate the complexities of classification. Strindberg's famous preface to *Miss Julie* explains how monologues can be made to be realistic. Rather than seeing them as a mixing of style, he writes, 'The monologue is nowadays abominated by our realists as being contrary to reality, but if I motivate it I make it realistic and thus use it to advantage' (1976, p.101). His examples, such as a servant girl talking to her cat or a mother prattling to her baby bring the monologue into a realistic frame since they justify the solo speech. However, this must be distinguished from the character's speech delivered directly to an acknowledged audience.

So from Beckerman we find a sense in which all theatre is presentational, and we can identify *direct* and *indirect* performances, but we can also find many performances which mix both forms of presentation. I am using Beckerman as an alternative theoretical lens to by-pass the oppositional vocabulary that distinguishes role from acting. In teacher-in-role we may well find a mix of direct and indirect presentation. In a way, as soon as a teacher-in-role speaks directly to the class, she is acknowledging the audience and therefore creating a direct presentational approach.

Aston and Savona's model: three modes of representation

We will now turn to a model set out in Aston and Savona's *Theatre As A Sign System*

They propose three different performance modes related to ideological positions. The first is *Conventionalised representation* which they associate with the *classic text*. They suggest that in open air theatre 'the actor-in-role functioned as a sign of the personated character' (p.46). The character is 'a function of action and of the thematic and ideological underpinnings of action' (p.34). Thus the character traits are connected with the action. The second mode is *Analogical representation* associated with *bourgeois text* in which the actor worked to identify herself with the character. The audience is thus positioned to identify the actor with the character, too. This corresponds with the development of interest in psychology and a greater interest in characters for themselves, and is therefore prevalent in nineteenth century theatrical developments and informs Stanislavski's system. The third mode, related to the *radical text*, is *Deconstructive representation*. Here characters are 're/presented as character, i.e. as construct' (p.35). The characters appear to know that they are part of a performance, they often break the audience/performance space conventions. Aston and Savona argue the familiar point that in this mode the audience 'is placed at a critical remove from the action and, in

consequence, from the likelihood of reflexive acts of emotional identification with the characters. Hence, a more active mode of spectatorship is placed on offer' (p.36).

This model opens up discussion between representation and presentation. If representation is copying life and in Neelands' view offering the audience no choices (2000a, p.49), and presentational theatre is acting with an awareness of the audience, where does the 'personated character' of Aston and Savona's first mode fit? Modes 2 and 3 can be aligned to Neelands' definition of presentational and representational forms, but mode 1 is more problematic. It works against a polarity. The actors in ancient Greek theatre could not identify with their roles entirely because many of the contemporary theatrical conventions made this difficult. They spoke in verse, men played women's parts, and huge 'unrealistic' masks were worn. However, we know that the actors sometimes performed in a trance-like state and the famous vase fragment shows the actor studying his mask to develop, it is assumed, some sort of association with the role he was to play. It has been argued that the design of the mask actually brought on an altered mental state to enhance the actor's performance. (Vovolis, 1996) Furthermore, the performance is thought to have brought about audience catharsis. So the theatre practice of ancient Greece which Aston and Savona classify as conventionalised representation, seems akin to what Neelands describes as representational theatre-making in terms of its audience experience, yet, there are obviously conventions which are more akin to Brecht's defamiliarising approach. Masks, singing and narration are all associated with an open acceptance of the theatre act; the act of theatre-making. So, again the representation/presentation dichotomy is exposed as restrictive.

There are also problems with this three mode model. It implies a logical development from the ancient Greek texts, to the realist texts, to Brechtian and post-modern texts. While it identifies a distance between ‘the real and the role’ closing and opening up again, it does not really give room for connections between ancient performance styles and those of radical texts, nor does it acknowledge developments in other theatrical traditions which have not followed such an (implied) progressive path. The model does not invite an awareness of intersections and mixes between the categories in the way Beckerman’s does. A final reservation about these modes concerns the dominance of the literary aesthetic (Neelands, 1998, pp.viii-ix). There are no examples drawn from non-written texts to highlight the different modes of approach.

However, it does provide another useful lens to look at teacher-in-role as it offers a distinction between types of distanced role. Firstly, there is the distance that is the *conventionalised representation*. There is some degree of identification with the role and yet this is conventionalised. There are conventions within which children interpret the signs of their teacher-in-role. They know not to expect costumes and make-up. There is no visual realism; the teacher looks like who she was at register, yet she appears to believe in her role. Interestingly, in drama in education there is an intention to provide a meaningful, moving experience, as there was in Greek theatre. Aston and Savona give us a model enabling us to examine another mode of distanced performance which could be applicable to classroom drama. If the teacher role player is distinct from the role, she may be at a ‘critical remove’ from it as defined by *deconstructive representation*. This is where the distance between actor and role is deliberate and made explicit. The duality is part of the performance encounter. In role I have operated in this mode. I have made a statement that I know has relevance to our shared ‘real lives’ as well as in the fiction.

Often it is a little joke for us as players. Occasionally children do the same thing so that a reference has dual relevance. It serves to remind us all of the duality and therefore clearly deconstructs the pretend.

These three modes make clear distinctions between two types of 'distanced' role and thus enable us to identify those moments of playfulness in our practice. In role a teacher may also make an aside which is deconstructing the pretend through a comment which has a serious intention regarding the shared 'real life'.

States' model: expressive, collaborative and representational modes

Let us now turn to Bert O. States' chapter, *The Actor's Presence: Three phenomenal modes* which proposes a view of the actor as a story teller 'whose speciality is that he *is* the story he is telling' (1996, p.22). From here he proposes three modes in which the actor can speak to the audience. The first is the self-expressive mode, the second is the collaborative mode and the third, the representational mode. 'In the self expressive mode the actor *seems* to be performing on his own behalf. He says in effect, "*See what I can do.*" ...The moment when artistry becomes the object of our attention' (p.26). He does not simply mean that we, the audience, recognise the actor, but that we recognise the artistry; 'we react to the actor's particular way of doing his role' (p.26). States suggests that there are certain parts which were written to display the prowess of particular actors and therefore are almost inevitably operating in this mode. He argues that some roles 'encourage the self-expressive tendency (Cyrano, Faust, Falstaff, Hamlet, Lear, Medea)' (p.24). It is very clear from what we have seen that Morgan and Saxton do not intend their teachers to take this approach to role. When they require teachers 'not' to act and 'not' to be a performer, it is probably that they do not believe that a teacher role should be

carried out in what States calls a 'self-expressive mode'. Throughout the literature of drama in education we have seen the articulated aim as being something other than drawing attention to the self or the teacher's performance skills. There may have been a sense that this would avoid 'acting', but States' distinctions of the actor's mode may be helpful in clarifying this as just one type of approach to acting.

The collaborative mode aims to 'break down the distance between actor and audience and to give the spectator something more than a passive role in the theatre exchange. The invitation to collaborate varies, of course, from the implicit to explicit, and from the token to the literal' (p. 29). Such collaborative moments will include examples cited in the discussion of presentational theatre. There is often a sense that the actor plays a character that lives in a world that includes the audience. It can be a play including just one character who does this, such as Tom Wingfield, or a few characters such as those in Shakespeare who soliloquise whereas others do not. Equally, in pantomime all characters acknowledge the audience. States articulates the difference between the audience in neo classical tragedy that has the status 'of a sort of *confidant* character ...unlike the "real" audience that modern participation theatre tries to involve quite literally in the play' (p.29). A recent Peepolikus production entitled *Goosebumps* required members of the audience to vote on a decision and some were drawn into the performance space to create one of the scenes. The Brechtian actor is placed as a collaborative actor, though States admits that this might at first appear to be an expressive mode of acting

'because he [the actor] was to a noticeable degree, still a performer standing just outside of his role. But this is not really self-expressiveness...this detachment, or coming forth, of the Brechtian actor is a strategy for keeping the spectator on the objective wave-length in

his “hearing” of the play. Obviously, the Brecht actor can find all sorts of self-expressive fissures in the Brecht text, but as an actor who has a distinctly non-representational relation to the audience, he works primarily in the collaborative mode’ (p.31).

The guiding characteristic States employs to identify the collaborative mode is the form of the ‘you’ address in relation to the audience. ‘One could think of this as a “we” voice in the sense that the audience joins the actors in the stage enterprise’ (ibid.), but States prefers to remain with the “you” voice. Both comply with what will be taking place in Morgan and Saxton’s teacher role-play. The participant audience will be addressed as ‘you’ and there may also be uses of “we”. What is required of the teacher-in-role could be seen as the collaborative mode of speaking to the audience/participants.

While Beckerman claims all theatre is presentational, States sees all theatre as representation, but behind the third mode, the ‘representational mode of performance, and our perception of it, is the shared sense that we come to the theatre primarily to see a play, not a performance.’ Here we

look in objectively on a “drama” with a beginning, middle, and end that is “occurring” before our eyes. All of the actor’s artistic energies now seem to be bent toward “becoming” his character and, for the audience, they cease to be artistic energies and become the facets of his character’s nature. It has nothing to do with credulity; the audience simply sees through the “sign language” of the art to the signified” beyond. The play is not a text, classic or brand new, out of which “magic” can be made; it is now an enactment of significant human experience ... So the virtuosity now lies in the power of

the subject, the collaboration in the mutual agreement by actor and audience on the value and appropriateness of the subject to the community of men (p.35).

States goes to great length to explain that his representational mode of performance does not imply a “realistic” style of production. ‘What we call realism is no closer to reality than many forms of representation we would call stylised’ (p.36). He argues that the suspension of disbelief is not dependent upon how much the production looks like real life, but ‘only on the power of the image to serve as a channel for what of reality is of immediate interest to the audience’ (p.37). He is also at pains to emphasise that although he uses the three modes distinctly as a convenience, he does not suggest that in theatre they are not frequently cohabiting. ‘There is no incompatibility among the modes: they co-exist continuously’ (p.35). To clarify the point he suggests that although one of the assumptions about ‘straight realism’ is that there is no acknowledgment of an audience presence, ‘a violation of this principle, properly prepared, is not incompatible with all forms of realism’ and he, too, quotes Tom Wingfield as an example. ‘The purpose of the collaborative principle here, of course, was to embed the “drama” in the wider frame of Tom’s reflective consciousness, no less realistic for being outside or beyond the action. In other words when the collaborative mode is invoked for thematic purposes it is no more destructive to the stage illusion, even a highly realistic one, than iambic pentameter or song in opera.’ It is simply a means of adjusting the audience’s illusionary nearness to the action’ (p.36).

States offers a model in which no categorical distinctions need to be made. It also pushes us away from a system that is bound by time and place. States’ system breaks down oppositional positions and opens up the inquiry, making a blend of modes possible.

Different approaches for different roles?

The first and perhaps most obvious point to make is that every individual actor will play a role differently. Hence, no Hamlet is ever the same as another. The way the character is portrayed depends to a large extent on the overall production vision. The same differences appear in teacher roles. I have observed many teachers taking roles that I have planned and am always intrigued by the way individual teachers make the roles, and indeed the dramas, their own. The roles are often played quite differently from the way I have played them, as Ian Holmes' Lear is different from Nigel Hawthorne's.

The most frequently cited approaches to acting in the western theatre are those established by Stanislavski and Brecht. The system Stanislavski laid out in *An Actor Prepares* (1993) has been a consistent part of actor training in spirit, if not to the letter. However, the approach to role described by Brecht in 'The Street Scene' (1964, pp.121-126) suggests something quite different. There is room for actors to implement different approaches for different plays. Simon Callow is clear about the way he approached his role when performing in *Fanshen*. He contrasts it with the approach required for performing the psychologist in *Mary Barnes*, where a more involved form of acting was deemed necessary. Callow explains that in *Fanshen* the particular characters are not important and thus the actor should not be psychologically engaged. (Callow, 1984) This is logical. The characters having been given no names are representatives of 'peasant', for example. Callow says of his work in *Fanshen*, 'I was just saying to the audience, "Ladies and gentlemen, this kind of person exists"'. When I spoke to him he compared this to the way he had performed Masha in *Three Sisters*. 'I tried to offer an x ray of her heart' (2000). In *Being an Actor*, (1984) he compares the role in *Fanshen* with his role in *Mary*

Barnes, a play that is inextricably bound up with individual characters partly because it was based on the lives of two real people.

Perhaps similar distinctions can be made in the roles that teachers play. If the teacher role is the newspaper editor of Neelands' drama (Neelands, 1993), then the character is irrelevant. Just as in *Fanshen* the character needs no name, the editor remains 'the editor'. Perhaps then Neelands' role was played simply with an awareness of what the role represented, i.e. standards in news articles, with no consideration of a character, a personality. In contrast, we could consider Lamont and Readman's teacher-in-role as a child frightened to go to school (1994). Or the role I play of an anxious girl who is afraid to go out in the snow because of an accident the previous year. The children meet a character called Suzie. (Ackroyd, 1994, see Appendix 5). She has a way of avoiding questions which tug at her fears, as well as being quite full of herself and a 'Tom Boy'. It is through gradually understanding the strengths and weaknesses of her personality that children begin to address her problem. When I play this role, I am aware that I need to create a character. She is not just a small girl; she is Suzie, just as Masha is Masha, an individual character in a particular context. I confess that my preparation has never been a deep psychological one, and I have never considered fears in my own experience. My Suzie might be described as *direct representation* as it involved a direct approach to the audience/children. It was operating in the *collective* mode since an active part was expected and indeed, demanded of that audience/children. Was I becoming the character or was I just 'communicating the play', in Mamet's terms?

The actor does not need to "become" the character. The phrase, in fact, has no meaning. There is no character. There are only lines upon a page. They are lines of dialogue meant

*to be said by an actor. And the actor is onstage to communicate the play to the audience.
That is the beginning and the end of his and her job.*

(Mamet, 1997, p.9)

This view of a delivery role for the actors is considered dated by many who see 'actors as artists in their own right rather than "mouthpieces" for the playwright's words' (Neelands & Dobson, 2000b, p.211). However, with the influence of poststructuralism there is a view that character does not 'exist' in real life, the actor therefore cannot 'become' that character on stage. For semioticians, of course, the character is no more or less than a set of signs.

It is clear then that actors are not always expected to 'become' the characters they are playing, and indeed, not all roles presented are full-blooded characters. Many roles in the sense that they perform as a social function, such as a worker, rich man, mother, politician. Often with no names beyond the label that determines that social function, the role is defined more quickly than a named character that we gradually get to know and understand. Such theatre is associated with expressionistic and Brechtian conventions which has an explicit socio-political agenda. I can recognise similar distinctions of role type in my own teacher roles. I have played the factory owner's spokesperson who is signified and relevant only in terms of her role as spokesperson for the factory owner. In contrast, Suzie is only met by the children as a young girl who is sad. The discovery of her accident in the snow the previous year is significant as the character and context of Suzie is gradually revealed. She has no particular social role that makes sense of the dramatic fiction. The social learning about resolving problems and supporting peers comes after the discovery of who Suzie is and what has befallen her.

I began this section by asking what kinds of approaches are required of teachers and actors. I have suggested that the Morgan and Saxton description defines what teacher-in-role should do by describing what an actor should do, according to actor and writer, Simon Callow. Morgan and Saxton and Callow raised the issue of representation. I have looked at views of representation as located in opposition to presentation. In seeking alternatives to these tight distinctions, I have provided three different models for approaching role and considered how they elucidate the theory and practice of teaching in role. Finally, I have discussed the different approaches that might be made with different roles both on stage and in the classroom, and the way that the portrayal of the same roles varies with the individuality of the role taker. This section has raised many questions about assumptions with regard to acting and theatrical approaches within the field of drama in education.

ASSUMPTIONS

Here I will examine two areas. Firstly, I wish to interrogate the assumptions about theatre and acting revealed through the review of literature on drama in education. This leads me to the need for a broader view of both theatre and acting, which in turn demands a redraft of the 'Categorising Teacher-in-role and Actor' grid displayed in the section's introduction. Secondly, I wish to consider possible reasons for the assumptions outlined. I will draw support from historical evidence about public perceptions of actors, upon documented evidence concerning a theatre-drama rift in the 1940s, and will consider why the assumptions of the past may have continued.

What assumptions have been held?

In the Preface of *Beginning Drama: 11-14* (1998a) Jonothan Neelands describes the type of theatre that he suggests is in the popular imagination.

It is a picture of theatre that is based on an economic agreement between the producers of theatre and the audience. The producers rehearse and develop a theatre product to the best of their abilities and, when the time comes, they perform their work in exchange for the price of a ticket (viii).

More often than not the product that is exchanged is based on the work of a playwright. There is an assumption in this model of theatre that the majority of us will see, rather than be in, such plays. Acting, producing theatre, is seen as something only a few can achieve. There is also the assumption that the audience in this literary theatre will be silent and

attentive to the work of the actors – audience responses are private rather than publicly shared as they might be in more popular forms of entertainment. I refer to theatre that corresponds to this image as belonging to the literary and private aesthetic tradition (Neelands, 1998a). If this popular image of theatre is the dominant one in most Western societies it should be remembered that there are alternative models of community theatre and performance which may bring us closer to recognising drama-making in schools as theatre. (1998a, Preface, p.viii)

This crystallises much of what I have been arguing in this section. A particular dominant view of theatre has been assumed to be the ‘common sense’ view which has led to specific assumptions about acting. We can identify assumptions within the field of drama in education:

ACTING INVOLVES

An awareness of audience	Being able to ‘read us and work with the energy of the audience’ (Morgan & Saxton, 1987, p. 34)
Inner life of characters	‘communicating the inner life of the character’ (ibid.) ‘representing the character to the audience’ (ibid.)
Developing a character	‘real acting...is to do with developing a character’ (Bolton, 1998, p. 195)
Changing voice and movement	‘not only adopting someone’s beliefs as in role play, but developing a sense of their character by altering the way you speak and move’ (Kempe, 1990, p. 178)
Costumes	‘teacher-in –role is not about acting in the external sense of putting on a costume and finding a voice and set of mannerisms for a character’ (Bowel & Heap, 2001, p.47)
Gestures	Being able to ‘convey subtleties of nuance and gesture’(Morgan & Saxton, 1987, p. 34)
No spontaneity	Being ‘no longer free to shift around spontaneously’ (ibid. p. 35)

Script	Those involved...were caught up in a dramatic experience that they created and maintained yet which possessed no prior script, fixed scenario, or separate audience,' (my highlighting)
Expectation of applause	'This tacit invitation from the actor for approval from an audience' (2001,)

Many of these points are used to justify the view that teacher-in-role is not acting, that it does not include those features which define the actor. Given these particular assumptions about the actor, teacher-in-role indeed looks very different. However, with a broader view of theatre and acting which encompasses a range of forms and styles, a distinction between teacher-in-role and acting becomes difficult to sustain. Throughout this section I have been offering alternative models of theatre and acting to those implied in the literature of drama in education. So, Boal’s actors challenge these assumptions, as do actors in street theatre, commedia and pantomime.

So a list of commonalities which may have read as

Teachers-in-role and actors both

- communicate through sign
- operate in fictional time
- operate in imagined space
- speak in the ‘here and now’
- have a captive audience
- structure rhythm and pace to keep others’ attention
- carry out planned work
- speak as someone other than themselves

might now be extended to include

deal with intervention

adapt to the responses to their work

may adopt different language registers

may adopt particular gestures

have particular intentions

Let us revisit the Categorising the TIR and Actor Grid (introduced at the beginning of this section) with our broader view of theatre and acting in the light of the explorations above. Changes can now be made to that grid. My alterations in the light of this section are in bold. In the original list the descriptors are different for the teacher-in-role and the actor. In this revised grid I have suggested alternative forms of theatre in which the actor's situation is not different from that of the teacher-in-role. Once types of theatre other than the dominant western traditional 'common sense' view are included, I suggest that the distinctions between the two largely disappear.

REVISED TIR/ACTOR GRID

	TEACHER-IN-ROLE	ACTOR
Overall power in the experience	the teacher is privileged	the audience is privileged
<i>In forum theatre it is the actor</i>		
Content	chosen by teacher	given to the actor
<i>In devised theatre it is often chosen by the actor(s)</i>		
Intention	to fulfil learning objectives	to entertain
<i>Theatre for health education, TIE & Brecht's lehrstucke have the intention to teach</i>		
Responsibility for audience welfare & behaviour	fully & legally responsible	no responsibility

<i>In community theatre, the actor might take responsibility & in murder mystery theatre, the 'audience' are customers and must be 'looked after' by the company</i>		
Audience attendance	compulsory	voluntary
<i>Theatre in Education is usually compulsory for the children who attend</i>		
Audience expectation	to learn (to be bored/interested?)	to be entertained (to be challenged/amused?)
<i>Theatres for development & health perform to audiences who expect to be taught something useful as well as be entertained</i>		
Audience role	active participation	inactive participation
<i>Active in Boal's forum theatre and commercial forms of interactive theatre/entertainment such as murder mystery theatre and pantomime</i>		
Audience relationships	familiar	unfamiliar
<i>Familiar in community theatre and often in Theatre in Education</i>		
Audience size	small group	large group
<i>Small in many applied theatre contexts, in prisons & theatre for very young children</i>		
Audience age	school age	mixed, usually a minority under 25 years
<i>More under 25 in children's theatre, youth theatre and pantomime</i>		
Social class of audience	in state system-mixed, often without upper middle & usually without upper class	predominantly middle class
<i>Mixed in street theatre, educational theatre, theatre for prisons and theatre for development</i>		
Selection of role	can be chosen, & can change at any time	given before event & cannot be changed
<i>Not always given in improvisation and theatre sports & requires constant change of role on the part of the actor</i>		
Response to audience reaction	flexibility to adapt & challenge audience assumptions	no verbal flexibility, no possibility to respond
<i>In improvised theatre –Johnstone's, commedia, & pantomime</i>		
Environment	school hall/classroom	theatre space
<i>Not always in a theatre – prisons, streets, village halls, school halls</i>		

In every case there is an example of some theatre form that blurs the boundaries between the experience of teacher-in-role and actor.

Why these assumptions?

There are a range of reasons that have led to the assumption that teacher-in-role is not acting. Since there has been a somewhat restricted view of theatre, there inevitably followed a similarly restricted view of the actor. I wish to propose that there are three further reasons why these assumptions may have been held. Firstly, there is the sense in which the actor is seen as undesirable. The actor is a show off, wants applause and is egocentric. Secondly, the rift that emerged between drama and theatre from the 1940s, and thirdly, a search for 'truth' that has been a driving force amongst teachers. We will look at each in turn.

Actors are undesirable

There are many sources where the historically low status of the actor has been recorded.

Remember that acting was once considered to be a very lowly and dubious occupation.

The first actors in fifth-century Athens were called hypocrites, meaning "answerer" or "interpreter", from which we get the word "hypocrite", meaning someone false or duplicitous. In the early days of the travelling theatre companies in America, actors were buried at the crossroads with a stake in their hearts.

(Neelands & Dobson, 2000b, p.9)

Suspicion of actors has not only been prevalent in the west. Throughout history and across cultures there has been a discomfort with the ambiguity between what is real and what is fictional. So while we know that 'in Rome acting was felt to be the work of slaves

and aliens...in modern Europe players long existed on the margins of law and religion'(The Cambridge Guide to Theatre, 1995, p.4) the same dubious status was awarded actors in the East. In Asia performers

were and often still are, equated with wanderers and beggars. Although in India, actors were believed to trace their ancestry to a member of the highest caste, the priestly Bharata, sacred myths tell how they were soon condemned to the lowest caste for their satire and mockery of the sages ...In China, decrees dating from as early as 1369 banned actors from entering for state examinations; while in Japan, support from the shogun and nobility for some sarugaku players became in time a rigourously circumscribed privilege which excluded the majority of popular performer (ibid.)

If actors had low status, women actors have been the lowest of the low. Women did not act in England until after the Restoration and even then 'no woman with serious pretensions to respectability would countenance a stage career' (Howe, 1992, p.32)

The choice of Alison Oddey's playful book title suggests that a dubious view of women actors remains strongly residual: *Performing Women: Stand-Ups, Strumpets and Itinerants* (1999).

In the UK there lingers a wariness of actors and an assumption that their moral codes are loose. There are many personal testimonials to evidence the negative view of actors, such as June Whitfield's anecdote: *The funny thing is that my grandfather would not allow my mother to go on the stage. He thought actors were all rogues and mountebanks* (1999, p.215). Actors are not seen to be like others and are simply not deemed trustworthy (Harrop,1992 and Neelands, 1998b). Teachers, on the other hand, must be deemed

trustworthy and responsible. They have always been required to at least appear to be above immorality, scandal and even bad manners. The role of educating children requires a particular demeanour. Heathcote hints at a view of actor mannerisms being seen as almost uncouth in an educational context: 'Coming from the theatre also, you don't consider sign to be bad manners. I still meet colleagues who somehow manage by *their* signing, to indicate to me that there is something rather ungenteel about behaving like that in classrooms' (1980). It is no wonder that there has been a desire to distance the work of teachers from that of actors.

The drama and theatre rift

The distinction between acting and teacher-in-role may be associated with the development of drama in education. When the drama in education movement began to develop there was a need to map itself an identity that was distinct. At the famous 1948 conference at the Bonnington Hotel, 'the distinction between techniques of creative dramatics and formal dramatics, or the production and performance of plays before an audience' was noted (Redington, 1952, p.6). This distinction was crucial for drama in education to develop. Peter Slade's vision for children's theatre meant that changes were made. He ensured audience intervention, demands and suggestions. (Lewicki, 1996, p.38). The terminology changed, too. He introduced the term 'child drama' (1954) and the now familiar term, drama in education was coined. These alternative labels reasserted a distinction from theatre. When the term theatre was not applied to class drama, one would not expect the word acting to be heard in relation to the children or the teacher. If the children and their teachers were acting, the approach would seem to be what people do on the stage and would not appear as the fresh innovative practice it was.

The search for universal truths and authenticity

The major practitioners of drama in education see themselves as 'deepening understanding' (Bolton, 1979, p.105) and enabling children to 'finish up thinking more deeply or rationally or intelligently about the subject' (ibid. p.92). Given this concern to justify drama in education in terms of its unique contribution to cognitive development, there has been a reluctance to see drama as in some way dealing with the fictional. Best writes

The notion of 'fiction' is also problematic. In a very common sense, to say that something is a fiction is to say that it is false, even a lie, whereas Gavin [Bolton] and I want to emphasise the vital potential of drama/theatre to reveal truths. To say that drama deals with the fictional may well contribute to the depressingly prevalent assumption that it is concerned with fantasy, escapism, what is not true. (2001, p.11)

As fiction and truth may be seen as problematic partners, so, too, acting and truth. Drama teachers see themselves exploring issues that are *real* and have *real* significance. An ironic paradox emerges. Since acting is associated with falsehood, it could not be deemed appropriate for the worthy and serious endeavours of classroom drama. It could be argued that there has been a residual Puritanism about the attitude towards actors and that this has seeped into the mindset of drama in education practitioners. With the elevation of sincerity as a principle public virtue (Sennett, 1977) acting, being by nature deceitful, presents a problem. Acting in common sense terms could not be expected to provide a way to truth and sincerity.

The tendency to see a contrast between teacher-in-role and acting which is prevalent with drama in education, stems from a nexus of pressures – a particular view of acting, a disparaging view of actors, the specific developmental history of the field, and the commitment of drama in education to a discourse which priorities cognitive issues and sets up a juxtaposition between fiction and truth – serving to militate against the two being seen in some ways indistinguishable from one another.

SECTION THREE: CLIMAX

CASE STUDIES

INTRODUCTION

Format

Each case study is organised in the same way. There are seven stages:

Introduction to the case study subject.

To provide a fresh perspective on the two education subjects famous in the field of drama in education, I asked them three specific questions:

1. How did you discover teacher-in-role?
2. What or who has most influenced your work?
3. What would you say has been your main contribution to the field of drama education?

The answers that O'Neill and O'Toole gave can be found in the appendices and are used to form the introductions to their case studies. I felt that the actor needed to be introduced differently from the two education practitioners. Since she is less likely to be known to experts in drama in education, many published articles and interviews provided the material for her introduction.

Narrative account of the session

The aim here is to provide a distanced, objective account of what took place in the drama.

Semiotic analysis of the session observations

I provide a semiotic system for analysing each of the case study observations. There are two tables. The first table looks at the practice of each over the whole dramatic encounter, and the second table focuses on a particular moment in the drama. The rationale for and an explanation of this approach are provided below.

The interview

The most relevant extracts of the interview are provided here, not necessarily in the order in which they were said. The interview has been edited to draw particular points together, but most of the content is included. The tapes of the interviews are provided (Appendix 8).

Analysis of interview

At this point the assumptions that lie behind each practitioner's thinking are explored, and evidence is located from the interviews. Here, informed by the research into assumptions in Section Two, I am concerned with the values that shape views that appear to be unquestioned.

Contextualising the case study

This stage provides an opportunity to consider the case study in the light of the theoretical examinations of Section Two. The practice will be analysed according to the theoretical criteria examined: Contexts and Audience relationships; Functions and Aims; Skills; Approaches.

Comment

Finally, the findings of the case study are brought together and I will pose consequential and implicit questions.

Semiotic analysis

In order to analyse the practice I observed, I decided to use a semiotic approach. Semiotics or semiology 'is concerned primarily, with how meaning is generated in "texts". It deals with signs and how they function' (Berger, 1991, [1933], p.14). The term 'semiology' was introduced by Saussure in 1915 (1966, p.16). Aston and Savona argue the case for viewing theatre semiotics 'not as a theoretical position, but as a *methodology*: as a way of working, of approaching theatre in order to open up new practices and possibilities of "seeing"' (1991, p.1). I wanted to use semiotics as a way of seeing, of sensitising my observation to what I may otherwise have missed. It also provided me with a systematic language with which to discuss what I saw, or what Aston and Savona describe as 'a base from which to assess what we have seen' (p.5).

I approached the preparation of a semiotic framework aware that there are many concerns and limitations with a semiotic approach. Firstly, as Esslin notes, 'the obscure language and excessively abstract way in which the, in many cases, outstandingly brilliant exponents of semiotics [present] their findings' (1987, p.11). Secondly, there is the fact that theatre does not stand still while an observer takes in every sign that exists at any one moment in time. Inevitably, some members of an audience will catch different signs from others (Harrup, 1992). Thirdly, there is the problem identified somewhat brutally by Jonathan Miller, that 'both critics and audience are led to over-interpret gestures and

expressions and read meanings into movements that had no significance whatever' (1972, p.365). This is certainly the case. Elam explains that

The audience starts with the assumptions that every detail is an intentional sign and whatever cannot be related to the representation as such is converted into a sign of the actor's very reality – it is not, in any case, excluded from semiosis (1991, p.9).

But what attracted me was the specific insights semiotics could offer an understanding of the actor, and in my project, the teacher-in-role. The actor herself is 'the dynamic unity of an entire set of signs' (Veltrusky, 1940, p.84). '...the actor's body acquires its mimetic and representational powers by becoming something other than itself, more and less than individual. This applies equally to his speech (which assumes the general signified "discourse") and to every aspect of his performance' (Elam, 1991, p.9). In the case studies, taking note of the oral text of the teacher-in-role and actor would not be adequate.

A linguistic utterance is not simply a product of the phonological, syntactic and semantic rules of the language. As we have seen, contextual constraints and the kinds of language-related behaviour accompanying the utterance are essential to its correct interpretation by the addressee. Intimately related to the speaker's parakinesic 'orchestrating' of the discourse are vocal characteristics with which he endows it over and above its phonemic and syntactic structure...Such features supply essential information regarding the speaker's state, intentions and attitudes, serving further (in conjunction with kinesic factors) to disambiguate the speech act (Elam, 1991, p.79)

I have been influenced by Elam’s approach to breaking down the actor’s ways of producing signs, such as body and voice and the paralinguistic repertory (ibid. pp. 32-97). I drew on his work to construct the semiotic system of analysis used in the three case studies. If semiotics can illuminate ‘how meaning is created and communicated through systems of encodable and decodable signs’ (Aston and Savona, 1991, p.3) in the theatre, it might be able to do the same for teacher-in-role, too.

The systematised semiotic analysis I used for all three case studies is exactly the same as the process that I use to analyse actors’ performances with drama students. It provides an attempt to analyse the activity objectively through a scientific deconstruction of the action. I apply two semiotic models. The first provides a detailed semiotic analysis of the session as a whole, taking generalisations at each stage to see if any patterns can be identified. It highlights the various ways that meaning is transmitted. These range from the words spoken (oral text) to the costume and properties, as indicated below.

Transmitters	Teacher	Role A	Role B
Oral text			
Paralinguistic features			
Kinesic factors			
Proxemic relations			
Vestimentary codes			
Properties			

The second focuses on a particular moment in the drama and enables a thorough semiotic inspection of that moment. The table provides an interpretation of both the encoding and decoding taking place in the selected moment of drama.

	<i>Encoding of meaning</i>			<i>Decoding of meaning</i>		
Source of information	Oral text	Paralinguistic register	Kinesic factors	Meaning	Intention	Desired audience reaction

Both semiotic enquiries bring to light different understandings which are explained in the context of each case study.

CECILY O'NEILL

A Case Study

Introduction to Cecily O'Neill

O'Neill began working in schools in London, initially teaching English and then drama. She was Warden of the Inner London Education Authority's Drama and Tape Centre, where she ran in-service courses for teachers between 1974 and 1986. The co-authored *Drama Guidelines* and *Drama Structures* (1976 and 1982) are products of this era. O'Neill later co-edited *Dorothy Heathcote: Collected Writings on Education and Drama* (1984). From London she moved to The Ohio State University in 1987 where she stayed until 2000. As Associate Professor of Drama Education she taught post-graduate courses and supervised students taking MA and Ph.D courses. *Drama Worlds: A Framework for Process Drama* (1995) was published during her time in the United States.

O'Neill began to use teacher-in-role having seen Heathcote and Bolton demonstrate the approach in the seventies. She says that she 'tried to emulate Dorothy, but became too controlling, and the kids often got rid of [her]' (Appendix 6). When she saw Bolton work, she thought that a lower-key role would suit her teaching style and capabilities better, so she began to use a 'kind of "bureaucratic" style' (ibid.). She used the status of the second in command because she saw that such a person is not worth opposing.

While she was 'inspired by the work of Heathcote' and 'thrilled to work with Keith Johnstone and Veronica Sherbourne' (ibid.), O'Neill sees her greatest influence as Gavin Bolton. 'I did my MA with him, but his grasp of form within process and his use of

significant content produced many “AHA!” moments, as I realised what drama could be.’(ibid.)

O’Neill acknowledges that *Drama Structures*, co-authored with Alan Lambert, has ‘been very influential and spawned many imitators. [Their] purpose in writing it was to make the kind of drama that Gavin and Dorothy espoused actually accessible to teachers. We felt we were interpreters of their approach. I feel I may have contributed to an understanding of the structure of Process Drama, as well as popularising the term. My aim was to convey how an open, episodic dramatic and largely improvised structure can generate a dramatic event where the episodes function as “a series of segmentations each possessing a sufficient demonstrative power” as Barthes puts it.’

CONTEXT OF OBSERVATION

When	18 th March, 2000
With whom	Royal National Youth Theatre group
Duration	2 hours
Where	A large rehearsal room at the Royal National Theatre
Participants	17 young people aged between 12 and 19 who were well acquainted with one another
Gender/ethnic mix	13 girls and 4 boys all white
Space	Large space with high ceilings and long mirrors
Experience	Many had been part of the group for 18 months. All were experienced in drama
Knowledge of leader	Two had once worked with O’Neill before

NARRATIVE ACCOUNT OF SESSION

The drama was planned to consider issues surrounding genetic engineering and the associated moral and ethical questions.

A range of warm-up activities included walking in space and introduction games. I was later told that O'Neill would not usually begin a drama in this way, but she knew that this group was used to beginning with exercises.

STAGE 1

The group was arranged on chairs in a circle. O'Neill explained, 'You are all outstanding in anything of your choice'. The context was explained: the participants had been invited to a conference centre where the facilities were of a very high quality. The young people were invited to contribute ideas to create a description of the lavish conference centre and its grounds.

O'Neill moved between narration, shared planning with the group, and the role of Mrs. Green, the conference convenor. Each participant created their own role deciding what it was that they were exceptionally good at and from whom they had received their skills and how they had developed them in their lives. Each shared these details with the others in the form of a general introductory session to the conference. Their choices ranged from Olympic athletes to actors. At this stage it was still unclear what the conference was actually about, but as role players they knew they were there because something set them apart from others.

STAGE 2

O'Neill's narration informed the group that it was now the following morning. The conference delegates were well rested. O'Neill then took on the role of Mrs. Green again

and stumblingly, hesitantly informed the group that it wasn't her fault or her responsibility, but she had been told to inform them that they were all clones. The delegates questioned and challenged Mrs. Green. They found it hard to believe and behaved as though they were upset. They were unable to discover much information from Mrs. Green, who was apparently not in a position to know all the details. She was after all 'just doing her job'. When they wanted to use the telephone to check the claims with their families, they were warned not to make any calls out of the conference centre; 'you know what papers are like'. They were told that the work on their cloning had all happened long before Dolly the sheep was brought to public attention. At this point the participants learned that the conference centre was owned by the Institute of Human Potential Development.

STAGE 3

Out of role, O'Neill asked the participants what they thought about the events in the drama so far. Each spoke in the role of a clone. The clones were asked what they would say to their originators, given the opportunity.

Mrs. Green gave out a second piece of information: the company is considering the fact that if an originator was sixty years old now, then the genetic material that had been used to create the delegates would be that age. This meant that at an age of twenty-four, the sprinter may be made up of sixty year old genetic material. There was much discussion as the participants asked more questions, and by their voices and expressions, appeared to become angry and/or upset.

STAGE 4

The participants changed role and were addressed as the originators, 'You agreed some while ago to donate genetic material'. They had a lengthy discussion with Mrs. Green claiming no responsibility, and claiming that the whole affair had been mishandled. The originators were as unhappy as the clones.

STAGE 5

Pair work followed to show a clone meeting 'its' originator. O'Neill's narration, suggesting that the truth of the cloning had been leaked to the media, concluded the session.

ADDITIONAL NOTE

At the end of the session O'Neill invited me to tell the young people why I was observing and asked them if they thought that she was acting. A girl explained that O'Neill was not acting at the beginning of the drama, but she was later on. This comment, and O'Neill's response to it, became a significant feature of the case study.

SEMIOTIC ANALYSIS OF THE SESSION

Two points emerge from the first semiotic experiment. Firstly, it is clear that semiotic analysis *can* be applied to teacher-in-role to elucidate the communication process, just as it does with actors in role. Secondly, the semiotic analysis identified significant changes in the communication through role that had been barely visible at the outset. Semiotics

enabled a clearer view of what had taken place. The sources of the signs transmitted in this case study are O'Neill as firstly the narrator, and also as Mrs Green at three different stages of the drama. The way O'Neill presents herself as teacher is the benchmark from which changes in signing can be identified.

The semiotic analysis reveals that there was no significant distinction between O'Neill the teacher and O'Neill the narrator. However, it identifies the distance between O'Neill the teacher and O'Neill as Mrs Green as changing during the drama. Mrs Green became progressively less like O'Neill the teacher, showing signs of emotional discomfort in stages two and three. The table charts these changes from the teacher to the narrator and congress convenor. The description in bold type signifies significant changes from the teacher.

Semiotic analysis: personas in stages 1, 2 and 3

Transmitters	Teacher	Narrator	Mrs. Green Stage 1	Mrs. Green Stage 2	Mrs. Green Stage3
Oral text	Straightforward, clear language, semi-formal register	The same, but with more descriptive language	The same, but a more formal register	The same, but a more formal register	The same, but a more formal register
Paralinguistic features	Mid range volume, regular pace, moderate pitch	The same, with slight upward inflection	The same	Faltering, hesitant. Communicat-ing discomfort	Disjointed, staccato, increased rhythm & volume. Communicat-ing tension, distance, and some despair
Kinesic factors	Minimal gesture, sitting still with minimal hand movement	The same	The same	Notable gestures: hands held up by head	Notable gestures: palms facing up at waist height, moving up and down heavily

Proxemic relations	On one chair in a circle of chairs for participants in the centre of the space.	The same	The same	Standing up	Standing up
Vestimentary codes	Trousers and top.	The same	The same	The same	The same
Properties	None	The same	The same	The same	The same

The table highlights distinguishable changes from O'Neill the teacher to O'Neill the teacher-in-role. As the tension of the drama increased, the body and voice of O'Neill changed. The plot required an altered Mrs Green from the quiet, controlled woman who introduced the congress. The further into the drama, the greater the difference between teacher and Mrs Green became. The 'metonymic accessories (costumes, properties, etc)' (Elam, 1991, p. 37) did not change at any point so the role-player remained the source of communicating signs. The identification of change facilitated by the table above helps to explain the girl's remark at the end of the drama. She may have seen O'Neill 'acting' at the end and not at the beginning because more explicit signing was taking place at the end.

I have chosen to examine a moment from the later part of the session when the student may have thought that O'Neill was acting. It comes where the differences between O'Neill as teacher and as Mrs Green are at a maximum.

Semiotic analysis: a moment of drama

	<i>Encoding of meaning</i>			<i>Decoding of meaning</i>		
Source of information	Oral text	Paralinguistic register	Kinesic factors	Meaning	Intention	Desired audience reaction
O'Neill	'This is very difficult. This is nothing to do with me. I must tell you, but I am not involved.'	Broken rhythm, irregular pauses, clipped enunciation: faltering, stumbling, breathy, hesitating.	Palms up & out at waist height, moving up & down heavily.	I am not comfortable with what I have to say. Don't blame me.	Emphasise the injustice of what has taken place.	Look beyond Mrs Green to the implications and issues.

‘Decoding’ refers to my decoding of what was probably intended. It may differ from the way individual participants actually decoded. This semiotic analysis enables a particular insight into exactly what was taking place when O’Neill worked in role, and how it communicated. Furthermore, it provides an explanation for the student’s remark that O’Neill was ‘acting’ at the end of the drama, but not at the beginning. The semiotic categories demonstrate that at the beginning Mrs. Green was like O’Neill herself in every way, calmly introducing the athletes to the conference centre just as she had calmly introduced herself to the students at the beginning of the session (as Cecily O’Neill). This may not have ‘looked’ like acting to the student, because there was no significant change. On entering the room a person may not have guessed that O’Neill was speaking as someone else. However, later in the drama, the semiotic analysis identifies distinctions between O’Neill the teacher and Mrs Green. There were gestures which clearly were not those of O’Neill. When the hand was on the hip and the palms were upwards with the giving of more distressing information, we all knew that if O’Neill stopped at that moment and spoke as herself, the arms would drop and the palms face to her side.

THE INTERVIEW

O'Neill contrasted teacher-in-role and acting as follows:

I've always seen it as a rather functional thing where you adopt a role in drama particularly, but you present an attitude or display a point of view or a perspective... I see it as marginally different to what the actor does. The actor, I feel, inhabits a role more fully, or a character more fully, because they know in advance the full extent of their character's history. They know the character's journey'.

This implies a distinction between improvised drama and drama developed from an agreed, preplanned text. O'Neill said that her role was different from the latter because she did not know Mrs. Green's journey, just the beginning and a few points on the way. ... *but I see it as being a fairly superficial kind of acting, if it is acting, because it mustn't draw attention. I have no interest in it drawing attention to any personal and internal qualities that Mrs. Green might be supposed to have, so I see her as extremely functional.*

When I suggested that we saw Mrs. Green looking guilty about the news she had to give, and that this perhaps suggested an internal existence for Mrs. Green, she explained

No. That's functional. That's her trying to get off the hook by saying 'I was only doing my job' ...It's functional because for the very reason that she doesn't want to be the person taking the blame... so all of those defensive tactics may look like character, but actually, they are also teacher functions or indeed playwright functions if you want to say that.

O'Neill's constant concern is that if the children become interested in the person of Mrs. Green, then she will have failed in the drama because *actually, I want to distance beyond her to the scientist or whoever...If I get interested in the character I am playing, the role I'm playing, then I've sort of failed because then it's going to be about me.* She talked of the types of roles she used to play in the past, referring to them as *heavy* roles. They were those in control who were eventually *got rid of...there was nowhere to go and ... it was just purely a confrontation.* Looking back she sees those roles as *more like characters...it was a struggle against the character and it seems to me that the struggle in drama is a more interesting one.* She was very keen to distinguish these roles of her past from the roles she now takes which do not set up confrontation.

I asked what O'Neill had understood by the girl's comment at the end about her acting at the end of the drama, but not at the beginning.

I think that what she meant was improvising, and I think that she could see that it was less of a scenario ...But I would have thought that I was always more acting at the beginning because I knew my script better than I did later on'.

Drama, for O'Neill, should not be focussed on the teacher's role. *I think teacher in role has a quality of presentation or representation of a particular kind of person. In my case it tends to refer to a fairly faceless bureaucratic kind of person.* O'Neill explained that often when she asks children whether they think her role was male or female, they are not really sure, and she reiterated the faceless nature of her roles.

I asked her what would have been the difference if I had watched the drama as a staged piece with a set and props.

It would have been very different in that the role of Mrs. Green would have been consistent. I think I would allow myself a level of inconsistency so that I can then become nice...and then that allows me to either get heavy or anxious or whatever I feel will press their buttons, whatever will be the most effective functionally. Whereas I think if it was to be staged, ... whoever played that part would have to establish a kind of type ... it would have a kind of internal consistency.

She is convinced that it is important for the kids to have something to look at so that their minds are taken off themselves.

O'Neill contrasted her own work with that of Jonathan Neelands. She sees his work in role as acting. She articulated two distinctions between her own work and Neelands' work. Firstly, he *becomes* the roles and creates characters. Neelands creates *a distinct individual who has a history and whose history is the meat of the drama*. Secondly, he becomes the focus of the dramas.

Now he works differently of course and he acts ... he will take on a character and he will become that character. I remember ... he became an African nursing mother. Now in a million years I wouldn't take on a role like that. I wouldn't know how to do it. I wouldn't know how to make it work for me the way he makes those roles work for him ... I couldn't make that kind of a role function in a kind of situation driven way. So he then becomes the subject of the drama and the focus of it ... he does it brilliantly and he's a terrific actor.

O'Neill prefers Bolton's term 'acting behaviour' to 'acting' because the latter *suggests a formal audience*. But the audience isn't the only issue for her and she frequently returned

to the issues of character and economy; *As our work approaches character, so real acting approaches our work - to participate or whatever doing a much lived down more economical bit of acting.* She identifies herself more closely with the type of work of Booth. I suggested that they shared a minimalist approach to roles to which she replied, *Absolutely. The less I can do the better, and a lot of the time I still do too much.* She admires minimalist role. Describing a performance of Miss Julie, O'Neill described Christopher Eccleston who took the role of Jean in the following ways: *he was acting - he was doing too much. She didn't believe his performance.*

I never think of myself as an actress and I'm not a very good actress ...I don't think I could be the sort of actor who loses himself in the role - I think I would always be thinking functionally ... whereas Jonothan - if he could sort of think himself into that person ... but he presents, he represents it in a way that I don't think I embody those roles like that ... reflecting an elaboration of the text.

Working with Keith Johnstone I remember he would say "Sit next to that person and don't do anything." It was an impossible task. Then he would say, "No, you are doing too much. Do less!" Despite the difficulties to achieve this, it is seen as simple as opposed to complex acting behaviour. My acting behaviour was extremely simple.

When asked to sum up the distinctions that a spectator might observe watching O'Neill and an actor, she explained

I think an actor would probably have a wider range of movement and gesture at his disposal and indeed vocal possibility because he would have been trained. He would have

techniques. He might not use vast gestures unless they were appropriate, but they would have the possibilities of elaboration...

and on to role,

What I'm thinking while I'm doing those fairly limited roles, that fairly limited acting behaviour, means I'm trying to launch the world and I'm trying to launch them in a situation ... and that's what's occupying me rather than any concern with how well I am representing whatever it is.

ANALYSIS OF INTERVIEW

The interview reveals the thinking that underpins O'Neill's values, understandings and assumptions. There are three main points which emerge that support a distinction between teacher-in-role and actor. I will examine her emphases and identify the opposition between teacher-in-role and acting that appears in what she says. O'Neill argues explicitly that teacher-in-role is not acting, but concedes that it may usefully be described as 'acting behaviour'. The table below proposes that there are assumptions about role and acting that have led her to make a distinction between the two, and locates the evidence from the interview. The right hand column provides an extract from the interview to evidence the point.

O'Neill interview: Differences between Teacher-in-Role & Acting

Teacher-in-role is	Acting is	Evidence
Being economical with text	Being elaborative with text	<i>An actor...would have the possibilities of elaboration</i>
A representation or presentation	Becoming a character	<i>Teacher-in-role has a quality of presentation or representation of a particular kind of person. Re Neelands he acts-he will take on a character and he will become that character</i>
Minimalism	Doing too much	<i>The less I can do, the better, and a lot of the time I still do too much; Re Eccleston he was acting. He was doing too much</i>
Improvising	Working from a script	<i>Girl thought I was not acting at the beginning- what she meant was improvising... I was more acting at the beginning because I knew my script more than I did later on, Re actors they know in advance the full extent of their character's history. They know the character's journey</i>
Not focus of attention	Focus of attention	<i>Fairly superficial kind of acting, if it is acting, because it mustn't draw attention. Distinguishes between her own and Neelands' work so he becomes the subject of the drama and the focus of it</i>
Not needing to be consistent during the drama	Consistent in role	<i>I would allow myself a level of inconsistency...whereas I think if it was staged, whoever played that part would have to establish...a kind of internal consistency</i>
Remaining outside the role	Embodying or becoming the character	<i>I want to distance. Compared with Neelands who acts, I don't think I embody those roles like that</i>
Very simple	Complex	<i>It is seen as simple as opposed to complex acting behaviour. My acting behaviour was extremely simple</i>
Having no interest in how well role is represented	Having an interest in how actor is being received by audience	<i>And that's what's occupying me rather than any concern with how well I'm representing whatever it is...</i>

Associated with a viewpoint or attitude	Associated with character	<i>As our work approaches character, so real acting approaches our work</i>
Working with a participant audience	Working with a formal audience	Likes Bolton's term 'acting behaviour' for role since it is different from 'acting' which suggests a formal audience
functional	A personal journey	<i>a rather functional thing where you adopt a role The actor, I feel, inhabits a role more fully, or a character more fully... They know the character's journey'</i>

This table provides a logic to O'Neill's position. The distinction between teacher-in-role and acting is a rational product of these assumptions about acting and role. The response to the girls' comment provides an interesting example. O'Neill thought that it would have been the other way around, that she was seen as acting at the beginning when she knew a script, but not at the end when she was improvising. Given the assumption that actors work from scripts, and teacher-in-role through improvisation, then the logic is straightforward.

Inherent to these assumptions is also a hierarchy: minimalism is clearly desirable, while elaboration is not. There is a preference for Brechtian conventions for teacher-in-role. The idea of presenting an attitude, rather than a character is significant. Teacher-in-role, as we have seen, need not be concerned with internal commitment to character. This is the business of acting. The notion of acting is reduced to the Stanislavskian model. Brechtian acting even with 'a formal audience' does not appear to be included in what is acting. Acting is seen as becoming immersed in a character. O'Neill explains that in *Miss Julie* Eccleston 'was acting. He was doing too much' and she 'didn't believe his performance'. From this it would follow that what is 'too much' is not believable. Minimalism is conceived as authentic. 'Too much' may be taken for over acting, or perhaps the actor

revealing his actor role, rather than keeping it concealed. The convention of concealing the effort, skills, and person of the actor is associated with psychological realism. This, too, would connect with O'Neill's notion of 'internal consistency'.

We can identify what O'Neill sees as crucial for role to secure pedagogic success. It is a distanced role requiring no internal, psychological process or consistency. What O'Neill admires in acting is consistency, with believable, minimalist signing and naturalist, inner portrayal.

CONTEXTUALISING THE CASE STUDY

I shall now look at the case study in the light of conceptual distinctions laid out earlier in the theoretical framework in Section Two. I shall consider the practice observed in the light of the four areas explored: Contexts and Audience Relationships; Functions and Aims; Skills; Approaches.

Contexts and Audience Relationships

This sample of practice provided a most interesting profile with regard to context and audience relationships. It was not carried out in a classroom, but a rehearsal room in the Royal National Theatre. Furthermore, the participants were not present for curriculum learning and their attendance was not compulsory since it was their choice to attend a youth theatre. The participant expectations were therefore to do drama, and to enjoy it.

These points immediately break down the initial Categorising TIR and Actor grid. In my attempt to suggest that the distinctions between the two were not so great, I suggested that

actors could work with compulsory audiences and outside theatre buildings, just like the teacher-in-role. However, here the gap between teacher-in-role and acting is closed from the other direction. Here the teacher-in-role is at a theatre building with no pedagogic obligation and voluntary participants who were committed to drama.

While there was no pedagogic obligation, O'Neill clearly had a triple intention which shaped her relationship with the participants. She wished to extend the drama skills of the participants, to give them an enjoyable session (in the interests of the youth theatre), and also to invite them to consider the complexities and possible problems of genetic engineering. These three intentions do not differentiate O'Neill's practice from that of many actors. Even where there is a non-participant audience, theatre often seeks to extend audience skills in reading theatre through innovative techniques for display or communicating meaning. There is a desire in contemporary theatre to educate audiences to interpret performance that does not follow traditional patterns of communication. Theatre de Complicite and Frantic Assembly are obvious examples. Actors in professional theatre are also keen to provide an enjoyable experience, just as O'Neill, even though they may not all be quite as cynical as drama critic and essayist, Kenneth Tynan, who saw a play as 'basically a means of spending two hours in the dark without being bored'(cited in Willis & D'Arienzo, 1981, p.179). O'Neill's desire to raise an issue that concerns her (genetic engineering) is, again, what playwrights and theatre makers do.

The grid below demonstrates how the context and some aspects of the relationship with the young people is closer to the usual work of an actor than that of O'Neill's teacher-in-role.

	O'NEILL SAMPLE OF PRACTICE	USUAL TEACHER-IN-ROLE
Context of drama	a session leader almost unknown to the group in a youth theatre at a theatre rehearsal space	leader is familiar class teacher with school children in a classroom, hall, or drama studio in school
Audience relationship	active participation amongst group	active participation amongst group
Attendance	voluntary	compulsory
Audience expectations	the participants expected to work on theatre skills -the long mirrored room produces particular expectations of theatre activity rather than learning they arrived expecting to enjoy themselves	children expect to learn something about the curriculum or drama some children may expect to enjoy the work
Attitude to participation	all eager to get involved	some children are eager to get involved

Functions and Aims

I wish to return to the moment in the drama examined earlier from a semiotic perspective. When O'Neill delivered lines in a hesitating, faltering way, she was signalling a personal response in Mrs. Green to the situation. She, Mrs. Green, was uncomfortable, otherwise she would not have hesitated. It took a while for the participants to actually discover what the problem was. They knew something was wrong, but because Mrs. Green was faltering, they didn't know immediately what it was. Clearly, this was a deliberate ploy to inject dramatic tension. It is a 'tension of the unknown' in Morgan and Saxton's terms (1987, p.7). The hesitancy had a clear intention: to make the participants anxious to know what they were not being told. The desire to know makes the delay of discovery significant. Hence that 'mental excitement', as Bolton describes tension, comes into play. So, the hesitancy might be described as functional in this context. The creation of tension was necessary to meet the demands of the art form. Without tension, there would be no interest and therefore, no drama. It is therefore an essential component of theatre as recognised by drama education practitioners (ibid. p.7, Kitson & Spiiby, 1997, p.92). This

also follows a traditional theatrical structure in which obstacles are set to block off the chance of early resolution to the problems and difficulties posed.

As we have seen, O'Neill argued that Mrs Green's hesitancy was functional. But, I would argue that this does not necessarily mean that the teacher-in-role is not doing what an actor does. Furthermore, its function could be identified as contributing to the creation of dramatic effect. The development of a dramatic fiction demands that dramatic tension be produced. It demands reaction between roles, be they actors or active participants. It is inevitable that reactions will distinguish roles. After all, in theatre we judge roles by the way they react to events and to each other.

From Propp's list of role functions, we could place Mrs. Green as a helper, even though she was the bearer of bad news. She was an enabler of sorts, the messenger through whom the participants could access information. Alternatively, she could be described as the false helper, since she was in the employ of the organisation perceived as the 'villain'. She may sit more neatly into Aston and Savona's conventional character function of confidante. She was sympathetic to the delegates, and did say that she felt the 'whole thing' had been very badly handled. The confidante functions to provide fictional details required for the drama. It is often the confidante who provides the exposition, setting the scene for the drama to begin. The nurse fulfils this function in *Medea*, just as Mrs Green does in O'Neill's session. The role of Mrs Green, like all the roles O'Neill now uses, are minor roles in the drama. She does not play the protagonist or antagonist, but one who serves the protagonist. The participants are thus often thrown into the role of antagonists. In this drama the clones challenge the company's aim to further their research into genetic engineering.

In order to function, O'Neill had to employ skills to signal that Mrs. Green was anxious about giving the information. The extract from the interview above exposes some slippage between the notions of the function of the role and of the role player. We can actually strip the process back to three layers:

1. **Functions of the drama**

The function of the teacher	to raise awareness about genetic issues
The function of the teacher-in-role	to engineer dramatic contexts through which to explore the issues
The function of the role	to carry out an efficient job at the congress

When Mrs. Green hesitates and falters on giving the information, we can identify specific functions at each stage:

2. **Functions at a moment in the drama**

The function of the teacher	to prepare the participants for something they will <i>disapprove</i> of to avoid confrontation between group and role
The function of the teacher-in-role	to create tension and slow down the action (using two traditional theatrical conventions to achieve both)
The function of the role	to ensure the clone delegates will <i>not get angry or blame her</i>

Breaking the layers of function up in this way enables us to see what is taking place. Firstly, a web of functions is revealed. The teacher has a teaching function, the teacher-in-role a function to create theatre form, and the role a function within the narrative. I have suggested earlier that functions are not value-free. Let us suppose that this dramatic structure is adapted by a teacher (Ms X) who is excited by the possibilities of genetic engineering. Her function may be declared in exactly the same way: to raise awareness of

genetic issues. The functions of teacher-in-role and role could be as for the drama above: engineering dramatic opportunities and carrying out an efficient job at the congress.

1. Functions for Ms X’s drama

The function of the teacher	to raise awareness about genetic issues
The function of the teacher-in-role	to engineer dramatic contexts through which to explore the issues
The function of the role	to carry out an efficient job at the congress

But when we move from the general functions to the specific moment in the drama when Mrs. Green delivers the news that the congress delegates are all clones, there may be some differences. Ms X, with a positive view of the opportunities afforded by genetic engineering, will prepare the participants for the news differently. Hence, the function of the teacher is different. This will in turn have an effect on the function of the teacher-in-role who could delay by stumbling with excitement building up the tension as the delegates are framed to anticipate some *exciting* news. It is this moment of preparation for the news of cloning that fulfils the concealed function of teacher. It shapes the way that the participants are required to react to the news.

2. Functions at a moment in Ms X’s drama

The teacher’s function	to prepare the participants for something they will <i>approve</i> of
The teacher-in-role’s function	to use the art form; creating tension and slowing down action (using two traditional theatrical conventions to achieve both)
The role’s function:	to ensure the clone delegates will <i>be ready for the excitement</i>

The functions are therefore interconnected and impact on one another. They are shaped by the aims and functions of the teacher. In the light of this example, we are forced again to reconsider the use of the word function. It becomes clear that to describe the function

of the teacher in value-neutral terms as ‘to raise awareness of genetic issues’ is misleading. The O’Neill lesson is raising awareness of the complexities and dangers involved in genetic engineering. (A problem emerges with the genetic engineering. The age of the material brings a fear and concern. The negativity is enhanced by the reference to the newspapers ‘getting hold of this’). Ms X’s lesson would be raising awareness of the opportunities genetic engineering could bring to human life.

Functions of O’Neill and Ms X

	O’Neill	Ms X
The teacher’s function	To raise awareness about genetic issues: the complexities and possible problems	To raise awareness about genetic issues: the opportunities genetic engineering could bring to human life

This example serves to remind us that there is no consensus over what should be taught about genetics, and therefore there can be no assumed ‘function of teacher’. Clearly, the *function* of the ‘role of teacher’ determines the *functions* of the ‘teacher-in-role’ and the ‘role’. The teacher-in-role and role both serve to provide an artistic logic to the unfolding events, which are planned according to the teacher’s intentions. (In the interview O’Neill explained that in delivering her role the priority is ‘whatever will be the most effective functionally’). This case study exemplifies my earlier proposal that the function of the teacher-in-role cannot be separated from the aims of the teacher. And since the function of the role player is to serve the functions of the overall aims, the teacher-in-role is not doing something significantly different from what an actor often does. The actor functions to fulfil the logic of the play and behaves according to the over all aims and intentions for the production. The case study example challenges a view that the teacher-in-role’s function is significantly different from that of the actor.

Skills

While in role, O'Neill shaped the aesthetic experience and structured events for the participants, as is customary in process drama. Appropriate signs were selected, moments made significant and tension created. In order to appear anxious, Mrs. Green had to hesitate, avoid direct eye contact with the participants, and change her oral delivery. She used the skills of signing through voice and gesture, body and facial expression. O'Neill also used her skills in improvisation, particularly spontaneity and narrative skills which are the key skills in Johnstone's improvisation (1981).

The table below identifies skills exhibited by O'Neill. The first list of skills is drawn from those anticipated for the teacher-in-role according to the literature explored in Section Two. The second list is taken from the National Council for Drama Training criteria reproduced earlier.

SKILLS EXHIBITED BY O'NEILL

Skills employed from the sphere of drama in education	structuring the drama like a dramatist signing through voice communicating through gesture improvisation skills i.e. spontaneity, narration skills, selection of significant parts of the oral text as a playwright listening to the participants responding to the participants
Skills employed from the sphere of acting	<ul style="list-style-type: none">c) create believable character and emotion appropriate to the demands of the text and productiond) define the objectives of a character and embody and express these within the context of a productionf) work sensitively with other actors in rehearsal and performanceg) show evidence within performance of creative imagination, emotion, thought, concentration and energyh) develop an effective working process and the ability to monitor and evaluate its applicationj) prepare and sustain the quality of concentration necessary for each performancem) communicate to an audience with expression, emotion and spontaneityn) adjust to the demands of different venues and mediao) adjust to the nature and reaction of different audiencest) create and sustain an improvised rehearsal or performance if required with discipline and spontaneityu) create and sustain an improvised rehearsal or performance if required with discipline and spontaneity

We saw in the National Council for Drama Training criteria that skills in characterisation are important for acting. The characteristics I noted of Mrs Green, were:

Anxiety communicated through her gesture and hesitation

Defensiveness because she refused to take any responsibility

Secrecy because it became obvious that she knew more than she told the participants

Manipulation in the way that she made the media a threat to force the participants to keep quiet

Subservience since she followed what her superiors instructed even when she was not entirely sure that this was the right course of action

While these were clearly designed to have a particular effect upon the participants (given teacher intentions), it does not negate the features as characteristics that were skilfully revealed through the drama, through what I argue are O'Neill's *acting* skills.

Approaches

In this drama it is difficult to distinguish between the character and the functions of the character, as Aston and Savona suggest (1991, p.46). We see Mrs Green as an anxious character only because the role had to function to stall information to build tension and to ensure that the teacher's role could not be blamed. O'Neill was determined not to have her role as the focus of the drama so, while Mrs Green was not the perpetrator of any unpleasantness herself, she could not be blamed. This avoided confrontation and maintained the focus on the issue rather than on Mrs. Green herself.

O'Neill suggests that Mrs. Green was not a character. O'Neill did not 'become immersed' or remain 'consistent'. But there were traits that identified Mrs. Green and I would argue that she was not inconsistent. She was calm when all was well at the beginning, and unsettled when she discovered she had a nasty job to do. This is understandable and

recognisable human behaviour. There was, as we have seen, some personality revealed through her response, although it was obviously a construct, purely to serve the drama, as it would be in any piece of theatre. O'Neill wants 'to distance' through her role. Her distance was evident at points in the drama when the artifice of the fictitious event was exposed. Her choice not to make any gestures to distinguish Mrs Green from the teacher out of role is one example. The lack of physical or special changes exposes the pretence. Another example is early in the drama. The famous people were invited to introduce themselves. Obviously this was a dramatic ploy since in real life famous people would probably have known each other. It exposes the duality of theatre. This initially looks like the sort of distance we might expect from Aston and Savona's radical text category. However, the strategy of explaining what would be obvious to characters in a play is not confined to such forms. It could equally be associated with traditional play structure. It was very common to have characters, often servants, in conversation at the beginning of early nineteenth century plays, who would reveal the exposition through transparently functional conversations with references to the household by name and family position. They thus provide details of relationships for characters who would already know all this. We accept the convention, though it breaks the logic of the illusion, since it gives us the details we require.

This distance through the role contrasts with the approach Ibsen would have expected of an actor playing Nora Helmer. He wanted the character to draw audiences in. He claimed to know all about his characters (1993). He understood more than was ever revealed of his characters in his plays, and hence a psychological integrity was required to play her as he intended. O'Neill does not need to know the sides of Mrs Green that are not relevant to

her social role as a congress convenor. This does not mean that she is not engaged in acting behaviour, merely that she is not engaged in the type of acting sought by Ibsen.

O'Neill is not comfortable with the notion of her roles being defined as characters, as we have seen, since she associates characters with acting. Acting a character requires an emotional engagement for the portrayal. This is not a position held by theorists, such as Hyman, however, who questions the term 'character' calling it a 'dangerous word because it implies a coherence, a consistency and an individuality, which may not be there' (1977, p.50). So there is an alternative view that 'character' and 'consistency' may not necessarily be so closely associated one with the other. Callow, quoted earlier, makes the point that not all acting parts require emotional engagement. O'Neill's role had particular requirements as did Callow's roles in *Fanshen* and *Mary Barnes*. Whilst characteristics were revealed, no attempt was made to construct a fully developed character. Both internal and external approaches (as identified earlier) were non-existent at the beginning of the drama, but as we have seen, external signs developed with the dramatic tension. Mrs Green operated through a conventionalised understanding of role, which for Aston and Savona is when a character is 'a function of action and of the thematic and ideological underpinnings of action' (p.34). Hence the character traits are entirely connected with the action.

The participants were actively involved in the action and in the creation of an oral script, as is standard practice in process drama. This is not unique to drama in education, however. In States' model of actor/role/ audience relationship in theatre, such an approach is seen as a collaborative mode of working. This analytical framework used to examine acting proves appropriate therefore for analysing O'Neill's teacher-in-role.

COMMENT

The case study has, through both session and interview, provided an insight into how O'Neill's drama operates. The semiotic analysis leads to the conclusion that O'Neill is acting when she works in role. However, the analysis of the interview reveals the logic of O'Neill's position, that acting is something very different. This view might well have some logical inner consistency based upon her assumptions which are largely those examined in Part 2 as dominant in the literature of drama in education. (This is despite her allying her work to that of avant-garde and contemporary theatre practice in *Drama Worlds*, 1995, p.xvii). However, it is somewhat less convincing when viewed from a position informed by theories of acting.

The sample of O'Neill's practice has enabled close connections to be made between teacher-in-role and acting in all four areas examined. The context of the session was striking for being in a theatre rehearsal room. The role can be seen to function in the same way as a role in theatre, while O'Neill revealed many acting skills. The approach of creating a distance between the role and the role player is easily identified in theatrical terms, just as the relationship between character and action.

I would argue that as a result of the analysis of both assumptions and practice through the theoretical lens, the distinction between teacher-in-role and actor looks fragile.

This drama engaged O'Neill in only one role and as a narrator. O'Toole's drama included many teacher roles, and adopted very different approaches to the roles. We will now turn

to his sample of practice to see if these conclusions are supported, and if any new theoretical implications emerge.

JOHN O'TOOLE

A Case Study

Introduction to John O'Toole

O'Toole first taught for three years in rural Cambridgeshire before moving to the North East. He worked for six years at Gateshead's Highfield Comprehensive School with David Davis, Mike Fleming and Geoff Gillham, all of whom would later become notable figures in the field of drama in education. He and others from the Durham MA group set up a part-time theatre in education company, 'South Tyneside TIE', developing projects with 'low-key fully integrated participation'. (Email, 2001, Appendix 7) Currently Associate Professor at Griffith University, Queensland, O'Toole is probably best known for his book entitled, *The Process of Drama* (1992). This was the culmination of his PhD thesis, which he chose to undertake in a theatre department, rather than an education department. O'Toole is credited for his theoretical framing of drama practice in theatre terms in this book.

Like O'Neill, he first came upon teacher-in-role on Bolton's course in Durham in 1968 and watched him and Heathcote using it. He was 'blown away by its possibilities'. His work in theatre in education influenced his classroom practice and it is to this that he ascribes his respect for theatricality in teacher-in-role. Despite this, he has stressed to teachers new to drama, that teacher-in-role 'did not have to be showy, nor did you have to be an actor.' 'The relationship between the two words in the phrase "actor-teacher" was one of the most interesting features' (ibid.) to O'Toole when he wrote his first book, *Theatre in Education*, (1977).

O'Toole claims to have been influenced by the practice of many teachers and students he has observed. 'It was really fascinating to watch and contrast Dorothy, so big and theatrical, yet beautifully anchored and down-to-earth, and Gavin, so absolutely minimal, but the kids were just as focussed and rapt.' (2001)

He sees himself as 'one of the mappers, advocates and collaborative consolidators' of the field. He is 'actually very proud of the development of drama in education in Australia, in which [he has] certainly played a part, in pushing and wheedling, in laying the ground intellectually and practically, and in sustaining a collaborative ethos.' He feels that 'in their own way both *Dramawise* (1988) and *The Process of Drama* (1992) maybe have helped to define and clarify the terminology, the concepts and the territory.' He has sought to 'analyse what "process" actually means, what the elements of drama are, and how the dramatic art form intersects or interacts with learning.'(ibid.)

CONTEXT OF OBSERVATION

When	1 st September, 1999
With whom	Second year education students who had all opted for a programme in drama.
Duration	2 hours.
Where	Griffith University, Brisbane, Queensland
Participants	18 young people aged between 19 and 23 who did not know each other very well
Gender/ethnic mix	Majority of women, predominantly white Australian. One Chinese student spoke English as her second language.
Space	A purpose built drama studio that was comfortable, carpeted, spacious yet intimate. There was raked seating and a stage opposite, with a broad working space between.
Experience	Most had had only a brief introduction to drama in education.
Knowledge of leader	They had not worked with O'Toole before.

NARRATIVE ACCOUNT OF SESSION

This drama was constructed to explore the origin of the most well known Australian song, *Waltzing Matilda*. It was being taught to student teachers who could engage in it at their own level, but also see it as suitable for their classrooms. The aim was to explore two versions of the song and to, in O'Toole's words, 'find out what it actually means and why it means that'.

O'Toole asked the group to join with him in singing the song. He then deliberately confused them by singing an unfamiliar version. Then they all sang the familiar version together.

STAGE 1

The fictional context opened in the future, in 3005. O'Toole was in role as the congress convenor who explained to the assembled linguistic experts that since they had specialised in the dead language of 'Ing-glish' they might be able to make sense of an exciting discovery. A relic had been discovered in a country that once existed called, 'Aw stray-lea'. They all knew that very few relics had ever been retrieved since the obliteration. The discovery was bits of writing. It would be very difficult to work out what it all meant, but those at the congress were invited to work in groups to see if they could hazard some informed guesses about the meanings of the strange words. It was generally thought that 'Matilda' must have been a god, and that 'billy' was probably the name given to a son and that people sacrificed their sons for the god.

STAGE 2

The convenor, offered the linguists the opportunity to make the most of new technology. Some human remains had been dug up from the same period, around 1890. The remains had been genetically injected so that the human, Jack McCann, was reconstructed. The linguists were invited to see if talking to him could help them to make sense of the fragments they had found.

O'Toole in role as the swagman, explained many terms such as 'swagger', and clarified elements of the past through his magic lantern. There were images of coolibah trees, waterholes and billabongs.

STAGE 3

As teacher, O'Toole explained that history always fails to pass down all the facts. He likened it to a tree. There are a certain number of leaves, but when they fall they scatter so that bits of evidence have to be gathered from here and there. As he said this, he threw some pieces of card into the air and invited the groups to gather them up. Each card was identified as A, B or C. Once gathered together the cards of each letter told a different story of the derivation of *Waltzing Matilda*. Each group shared the information they had learnt from the cards:

There was a depression in 1891-4. Wages had been reduced and shearers went on strike for 5 years. There had been an arson attack on a barn. It was obviously assumed to be the work of the bitter shearers and swaggers. Mr. Banjo Patterson had written the song during this time.

STAGE 4

The group was divided into two halves. One half were the 'inlaws'. These people saw themselves as respectable rich landowners and shop owners supportive of the status quo. The other half were the 'outlaws' who were against the way things were being run. They included the impoverished, striking shearers and swaggers without jobs. Both groups created images to depict their contexts.

Then a scene was set in a hotel bar. It was a very special night because a singer was coming to sing a brand new song, which they would all love. A visiting 'Brit', Sir Herbert Ramsey, would sing Banjo Patterson's song. He sang in an upper class English voice and took a collection at the end for the restoration of a barn, which had been burnt down. The 'outlaws' were rather rowdy and not too inclined to contribute to the collection.

O'Toole stopped the drama to explain that this told of how the song may have first been sung. However, there is another version. They reran the scene, but this time O'Toole took the role of Mr. One Eye'd McCarthy, an Irish immigrant who wore a leather hat and an eye patch. He sang a slightly different tune - the one O'Toole began the session with. I noticed that some of the 'in-laws' did not join in when he sang this time since he clearly identified himself with the 'outlaws'.

STAGE 5

O'Toole narrated that since the hotel had had such a successful evening, a theatre festival was organised. Groups were invited to create 20 seconds worth of plays that both groups

of people might have produced. The ‘outlaws’ depicted the swaggers starving and forced into sheep stealing whilst the ‘inlaws’ demonstrated the injustice of working hard to keep the sheep alive, only to have them stolen.

Again, O’Toole narrated moving the context forward to 1996 when there had been celebrations to mark the song’s centenary. All were asked to take the roles of 16year old school pupils who represented the descendants of those in the drama they had just created. Each was asked to imagine that they had just seen the short plays as part of the centenary celebrations. They were each required to produce two sentences: one to position their attitude to the law, and one to refer to one of the plays explaining why it had made an impact on them.

O’Toole explained that during the three years of the Boer War soldiers had sung the song. The soldiers would have been from a mixture of ‘in’ and ‘out’ law backgrounds, but they all sang the same song. He imagined that the song could be sung from both positions.

SEMIOTIC ANALYSIS OF SESSION

Below I apply my generalised semiotic framework to each role played by O’Toole including that of the narrator, in exactly the same way as I had done with O’Neill’s drama.

Semiotic analysis: personas in stages 1,2,3,4 & 5

Transmitters	Teacher	Congress convenor	Jack McCann	One Eye'd McCarthy	Sir Herbert	Narrator
Oral text	Straight-forward, clear language, semi-formal register	Same, but more specialist linguistic. Neologisms and deliberate mispronunciation	Slang, language of the working context and region. Short exclamations, e.g. 'I ask ya'.	Slang, familiar, 'down to earth' language, e.g. 'eh, coppers'	Precise choice of language, formal and articulate	Poetic, formal, elaborate, figurative language e.g. 'leaves of history'
Para-linguistic features	Moderate volume, regular pace, moderate pitch	Same, but slightly louder	Thick, rough Australian accent. High volume, with words often spoken through laughter	regular pace, moderate volume, with varied pitch	Upper class English accent. Low volume, even pace and pitch	theatrical significance given to words through pace, rhythm and enunciation, and contrast in volume
Kinesic factors	Minimal gesture, standing still with some minor hand movement	Same, but some very deliberate minor hand gestures	Angular gait with protruding elbows and knees	jerky, but confident gestures	Mannered gestures, head tilting upwards, and eyes that looked down on some of those he spoke to	Deliberate, consciously theatrical gestures
Proxemic relations	In front of participants, at close proximity	Same	Sitting in his own space on a stool in front of the linguists with a table between him and the participants	Sitting on a stool in front of the inlaws and outlaws, with no barrier between them	Sitting on a stool in front of the inlaws and outlaws, with no barrier between them	Moving in among the participants
Vestiment-ary codes	Trousers and shirt	Same	Same with a waistcoat	Same with an eye patch	Same with a wide brimmed hat	Same
Properties	None	None	A overhead projector that represented a hologram bringing images from the past	Guitar	Guitar	Cards with historical information

The table highlights the changes that were distinguishable between O'Toole as teacher, congress convenor and the three roles and as narrator. The framework illuminates significant differences in the way each role was portrayed. The 'metonymic accessories

(costumes, properties, etc)' (Elam, 1991, p.37) changed for each named role and worked together with the role player to communicate meaning. The semiotic analysis indicates significant change between O'Toole as teacher and as narrator, which is interesting since the narrator was not strictly identified as a role. There were no costume changes, but there was a shift in language register, gesture and kinesic and proxemic features. This might usefully be identified as the type of activity that Kirby calls 'performance' since there is a consciousness of audience, yet no pretence to be anyone else. (Section One, Definitions)

The roles of McCann, One Ey'd McCarthy and Sir Herbert are different in the semiotic framework due to their distinct feigned identities.

The moment selected for analysis appears in Stage 4 of the drama. Sir Herbert is addressing the two groups of audience in a crowded bar. The 'outlaws' are on his left, being very rowdy in the way they join in the singing. The 'inlaws' are on his right. They are much more subdued. Sir Herbert's pause during his song is the moment for semiotic examination.

Semiotic analysis: a moment of drama

	Encoding of meaning			Decoding of meaning		
Source of information	Oral text	Paralinguistic register	Kinesic factors	Meaning	Intention	Desired audience reaction
O'Toole	'We might just sing it a little more gently to allow these good folk here to give it a whirl.'	Smooth even rhythm, slow delivery, with no pauses and no hesitation. Loud and steady with clear enunciation.	Right hand raised across the body like a 'stop' signal to the 'outlaws', then the arm moves to the right, lowering as it does so with the palm turning upwards. The sharp stiffness of the first gesture shifts to a looser position where the fingers are no longer stiff and straight, but slightly curved.	I am on the side of the 'inlaws'. I wish to give them voice and respect. Your voice is not wanted.	To increase the tensions between the two groups. To demonstrate the privileged position of the 'inlaws' over the 'outlaws'.	Be drawn to consider the social difference and thus the extreme difference in life styles.

To further contextualise this moment it is worth adding that when Sir Herbert had finished singing the song, he invited donations for the poor 'inlaws' who had had a barn burned down by the striking shearers.

Here, again, the semiotic approach provides useful insights. The hand gestures operated more powerfully in the communication process than the words themselves. The signing of the teacher-in-role was crucial to incite the required irritation from the 'outlaws'. As a result of this semiotic analysis, I have watched and re-watched the video to describe the two hand positions at the beginning and end of this moment of dramatic action. The contrast between them is striking. The first is harsh, sharp, flat and dominating, while the second is offering, empowering and respectful. The oral text, whether planned or

improvised, is relevant with its use of 'gentle' and 'good', but its relevance is only made significant by additional considerations. '...the conversational use of spoken language cannot properly be understood unless paralinguistic elements are taken into account' (Abercrombie, 1968, p.55)

THE INTERVIEW

I asked O'Toole how he would describe what he does in role.

Whatever I'm trying to construct, the first thing I obviously do is identify the purpose of the role and along with that try to identify a status level that will not only facilitate the purpose, but allow my intervention actually to be quite minimum. So my first concerns are to find the purpose and the status of the role. I often like to play low status roles so that even if I am playing a high status role, I try and find a way in for the kids to have some power over me. I think in a way there was a bit of that in all of them.

O'Toole explained the purpose of the roles he played and what distinguished them from one another. The range covered 'shadowy' roles, caricatures and theatrical teacher narration.

He described the congress convenor as a 'low key role', 'it was an unnamed role'. He distinguishes between how he would have been perceived as a teacher and in this first role.

I used a change of signaling, I think. I tried to indicate that I was somebody else in what I was saying; I was immediately enrolling them as somebody else. 'Ladies and Gentlemen', I mean, lecturers don't usually say 'Ladies and Gentleman', well, I don't.

I hope that I was laying a trail of language that was sufficiently interesting and appropriate to the task. So the way I think the performance element was, was mostly in the language and least in the gesture. I was certainly using a special language relating to the historical position of the linguists, and I also started laying trails, dropping hints for use of the word "English" to be used later.

O'Toole introduced the word 'performance' to explain this role. Given the task was to set up a fictional context, he explained,

I think I deliberately used very very minimal role signals, particularly physical ones; I didn't try and come on as an interesting character in himself. It was important they focussed on the task, not the character.

I asked him if he thought that the congress convenor was a 'character' or a 'role'.

Well in the sense that it was a fictional person, he was a character in the fictionalised set up of linguist in the future, and this was the congress convenor inviting them. So in the standard sense of the word 'character', I was taking on the role of that fictional character.

O'Toole also identified a clear function for Jack McCann, his second role. It was *to give them opportunity to get the history right again... an information giving role*. Continually referring to the status of teacher roles, O'Toole saw this role as *low status*. *He (McCann) had knowledge, they had power*. Unlike the congress convenor role, Jack had required extensive research;

I had to know enough about sheep to play authentically an old cow cockier or a sheep grazier because there might have been students who knew a great deal about grazing, so in that sense it was a tightly constructed fictional character. I actually put on quite a strong accent which I hoped was a real Australian accent or a believable Australian accent. I also used a lot of slang.

He added, *I did take care making him a person this time.*

Sir Herbert and One Eye'd McCarthy were in O'Toole's mind *mirror images of each other*, used to provide a way to look at the deep social divisions that existed. He suggests that they were *very much simple stereotype caricatures*.

They were meant to be a pompous upper class pom, and a jolly larakin drover. McCarthy and Sir Herbert were both real people and so that was where, I guess, I deliberately simplify and falsify history. Probably Sir Herbert was a very nice chap and not an absolute pompous twit. One Ey'd McCarthy might have been a rogue and a liar, I don't know.

The 'role' we both found most interesting to discuss was the teacher/narrator role. When O'Toole narrated details about history and evidence, 'the leaves of history' part of his narration, he was obviously not in role in one sense, and yet, he was clearly not purely teacher in another.

When I told them the story of how the song became famous, taking the teacher's real life role or not, of the storyteller. I was taking a stand or a position which was not being ordinary life; a quite different voice. I was adopting a position, a narrator position and performing it quite hard.

This was the moment when O'Toole threw pieces of paper into the air to make a point emphatically. I suggested that there may have been more theatricality in this non-role moment than in the clearly defined role of the congress convenor.

Yes, that's right. There was a skeletal persona in the convenor in terms of how I performed it, or lived it. An interesting distinction: I was more in the real world, in the real context as the narrator. I suspect I probably used my voice and gesture more theatrically because I was trying to highlight theatrically a moment of real life if you like, whereas as the convenor I was trying to minimise a moment of dramatic action and characterisation. I was trying to set up a physical moment of theatre, an image. I had to minimise the role because I didn't want the students to concentrate on me. I wanted them to concentrate on the bits of paper and similarly when I was asking questions I wanted them to concentrate on the story they had concocted.

He went on to explain that this narrator role was a role that had one foot in the normal use of the word role that we use as the persona for the teacher demonstrating in the public action with the children in their classroom, and the other foot was in the dramatic context and I was hoping to further the dramatic context with it. I think that was only one step behind my first role of the convenor.

When I asked about role, character and acting, he talked of a continuum along which one may chart types of role/acting behaviour.

In a way this is the continuum I am talking about and in a way the words role and character when they are put as polarities aren't necessarily helpful, though they can be useful. So I would say those first two I guess were roles in a primitive sense, the future congress convenor was a character but he had a clear sort of employment function as a congress convenor. I mean, there was almost a prototype character, an outline sketchpad character.

I wondered whether an emotional engagement with the role has any significance.

As the storyteller [narrator/teacher] I was actually getting right into telling the story of Waltzing Matilda and the First World War and how I got right into it! There was certainly an emotional engagement there. There was the least emotional engagement, I guess, as the convenor when as I say my aim was to make it minimal and I was almost not able to be there.

ANALYSIS OF INTERVIEW

In considering the assumptions, and conceptualisations that underpin O'Toole's thinking, it is worth remembering a quotation in the introduction to O'Toole at the beginning of this case study. He has written that it was his theatre in education experience that had given him an enduring 'respect for theatricality in teacher-in-role'. I will consider the implications of what was said in the interview to see what this notion of theatricality means.

Details from the interview (and examples discussed from the session) are systematically laid out below in a table that demonstrates my interpretation of what O'Toole believes about role. These views appear in the left hand column, any qualifications to these views in the middle column, and the evidence in the right.

O'Toole interview: Views on teacher-in-role

View on role	Qualifying point/s	Evidence
Can use costume	does not have to do so	congress convenor had no costume, but other three roles had waistcoat, eye patch or hat
Can use properties	-does not have to do so -teacher can use resources (properties) out of role	-congress convenor used no properties, but McCann had a magic lantern and the other two had guitars. -teacher used information cards
Can use space theatrically – designating space and using proxemics: shape and spatial organisation	-does not have to do so -teacher can use space theatrically out of role	-congress convenor used the space conventionally as a teacher uses it. McCann took his own space apart from the participants - teacher/narrator moved between participants when throwing cards

Can be a caricature	role does not have to be caricature	<i>unlike Jack McCann, both Sir Herbert and One Ey'd McCarthy were very much simple stereotype caricatures.</i>
Can involve emotional commitment	-teaching can involve emotional commitment, too - role does not have to do so	<i>as the story teller [narrator/teacher] I was actually getting right into telling the story of Waltzing Matilda and the First World War and how I got right into it! There was certainly an emotional engagement there. There was the least emotional engagement, I guess, as the convenor</i>
Played in a minimalist way it does not involve emotion		<i>there was least emotional engagement, I guess, as the convenor when as I say, my aim was to make it minimal and I was</i>
Can be a character	there are different degrees of characterisation	<i>the words role and character when they are put as polarities aren't necessarily helpful... those first two were roles in a primitive sense. The future congress convenor was a character but he had a clear sort of employment function as a congress convenor. I mean, there was almost a prototype character, an outline sketchpad character.</i>
Should not draw attention		<i>It was important they focussed on the task, not the character (re convenor)</i>

The table exposes a very broad view of what teacher-in-role can be and a view that while teacher-in-role can be highly theatrical, so too, can teaching out of role.

Role is not given strict parameters. Nothing appears to be excluded, at least as a possibility. The theatricality out of role was developed in order *to emphasise a point*, and yet limited in role to prevent the role becoming *the focus of attention*.

The role of the congress convenor was articulated as minimally played, just as O'Neill's congress convenor. Yet other roles were not specifically articulated as minimal. This aspect of the differences between the roles was not discussed. The interview included very familiar discourse about teacher-in-role, creating the same conceptualisations as O'Neill levelled, such as

- *adopting a position*
- *low key role*
- the importance of the participants *being focussed on the task, not the character*
- *minimalist* role taking
- *behind the scenes sort of role*

O'Toole referred to these familiar ideas in relation to the congress convenor, but not with reference to Jack McCann, One Ey'd McCarthy or Sir Herbert. They do not fit the discourse he continues to use, yet he provides no alternative notion of role in relation to these particular roles. From this interview it is clear that O'Toole articulates what has been unquestioned by the field in general, yet does not respond to the fact that this discourse does not describe many of the roles he takes. He is, however, fully aware of the theatricality of his work, as we have seen, and has a much broader notion of teacher-in-role than he actually articulates in these familiar adages.

O'Toole explained the teacher as narrator telling about the 'leaves of history' as *a stand or position which was not being ordinary life, a quite different voice. I was adopting a position, a narrator position and performing it quite hard*. He used the terms 'performing' and 'character' freely when referring to the roles he had played. He did not,

however, refer to ‘acting’. He argued against a distinction between role and character by putting them onto one continuum. The congress convenor, therefore would be closer to the ‘role’ end of the continuum, and Sir Herbert towards ‘character’ at the other. But, it becomes clear that he has a different understanding of ‘character’ than O’Neill. The convenor was a ‘kind of prototype character, an outline, sketch pad character’, but he does not assume that any inner engagement or elaboration is required. While he refers to ‘prototype’ characters, his theory leans towards the givens of drama in education.

CONTEXTUALISING THE CASE STUDY

Again, I will look at the case study in the light of conceptual distinctions laid out earlier in the theoretical framework in Section Two. I shall consider the practice observed in the light of the four areas explored: Contexts and Audience Relationships; Functions and Aims; Skills; Approaches.

Context and Audience Relationship

The context for this sample of practice was, again, not the most common one for drama in education. The space was a purpose built drama studio at a university and the participants were young adults who had opted for a course in drama in education in their teacher-training programme. Like a traditional theatre audience, attendance was voluntary, but unlike a traditional theatre audience their expectations were to learn. In this context, to learn how they could use drama as teachers in the classroom situation. Again, our original Categorising TIR and Actor grid is disrupted in that the drama studio venue and the voluntary participants would be more likely to appear in the actor’s column than the teacher-in-role’s. Given, too, that working with active participants might be as much a

part of an actor's work as a teacher-in-role's, there is little to substantiate a distinction between O'Toole's teacher-in-role and acting with regards to context and audience relationships.

Issues of function

It was very interesting that in answer to my question about what O'Toole does when taking a role, I received a reply about aims and functions.

Through an exploration of functions, I shall identify O'Toole's attempt to break down 'politically correct' assumptions about practice, but will suggest that while taking us on a significant new road, he has not in this drama followed the full logic of his articulated position. Earlier, I have identified the dominant discourse that identifies drama education as a way to seek and discover 'truth' and 'meaning'. O'Toole has argued that drama practice has been too 'comfortable' and suggested that alternative positions should be 'played with'; that those with which we do not agree should not be excluded from the classroom (conference paper, 2001). In spite of this conviction, O'Toole reproduces the familiar 'truth' rationale in the interview, even though, the drama purports to be offering different possibilities concerning the origins of *Waltzing Matilda*. In order to examine complexities and possibilities I shall take it step by step.

When introducing the drama to student teachers, O'Toole explained that the drama was to explore *what the song actually means and why it was written*. The use of 'actually' suggests that there have been some misunderstandings, but there is an *actual* meaning that will be discovered through the drama. Given this aim, it is easy to see how the role of Jack McCann fulfils his purpose to provide information that will lead towards an

understanding of what the song *actually means*. McCann is able to explain what some of the terms mean and explain the context of sheep swaggers when the song was written. His role function would, therefore, be identified by Propp as the helper.

1. **Functions of the drama - McCann**

The function of the teacher	to explore <i>what the song actually means and why it was written</i> ,
The function of the teacher-in-role	<i>to give them opportunity to get the history right again; an information giving role.</i>
The function of the role	to tell the linguists about his life on the land.

Strikingly, this table highlights the *function* of the ‘role of teacher’ determining the *functions* of the ‘teacher-in-role’ and therefore the ‘role’ exactly like the function table in the O’Neill case study.

Turning to Sir Herbert and the moment analysed earlier, we can also identify specific functions. This role is used to approach the second part of the aim – the social divisions.

2. **Functions at a moment in the drama – Sir Herbert**

The function of the teacher	to highlight the social divisions between the two groups
The function of the teacher-in-role	to create tension between the groups and provoke a reaction from the group in role as ‘outlaws’ (within the logic of the drama)
The function of the role	to entertain his audience and ensure the ‘inlaw’ group, with whom he identifies, enjoy themselves, have a role in the event, and are not overwhelmed by the ‘outlaws’

Again, a web of functions is revealed. The teacher has a teaching function, the teacher-in-role, a function to create dramatic tension, and the role to function within the narrative.

The function within the narrative is again, an inevitable product of the teacher's aims. Sir Hubert functioned to highlight social divisions and draw the outlaws' attention to them.

The scene with Sir Herbert singing in the hotel was then re-run with O'Toole offering a different possibility for the first ever rendition of the song. McCarthy, on the side of the 'outlaws', made his allegiance equally clear. So there are two possible versions of events. This presentation of different possibilities appears to support the view that O'Toole articulates about the need for drama to play with a range of viewpoints and not just the 'politically correct' ones. (ibid.) It promotes a view of alternatives, a breaking down of grand narratives. It goes against the view of finding an 'actual' meaning by offering two histories. This drama at first appears to be a clear attempt to break down the view of a single version of the 'truth.'

However, it does not offer equal credibility to each version. The lesson is taught from a position that is sympathetic to the 'outlaws'.

Sir Herbert was meant to be a pompous upper class pomme, and One Ey'd McCarthy was meant to be a jolly larakin drover ... [they] were both real people and so I guess I deliberately simplified and falsified history. Probably Sir Herbert was a very nice chap and not at all an absolute pompous twit. One Ey'd McCarthy might have been a rogue and a liar, I don't know, but ... it was grounded in truth so we could take liberties with it to find out the truth.

Who will believe a pompous twit? We are presented with a radical perspective from a desire to reveal the social differences with a particular political bias. Sir Herbert might

have been a *nice chap*, but if he was a *nice chap* in the drama, then criticism of the ruling class would not have been so implicit. As a *pompous twit*, he contrasted with the affable, good-humoured jolly drover, McCarthy. The power differential works against the likeable character so the participants see the situation as unjust. Creating someone so pompous guarantees a negative reaction from the participants. So, given the drama presents a rich man as the buffoon, and the worker as the hero the two positions are not presented equally, and the drama is intrinsically involved in values. A liberal, leftist perspective is privileged as 'actual'. However much one may sympathise, it cannot be portrayed as universal truth. For example, the indigenous aboriginal perspective is totally invisible and would offer a different critical lens through which to view the history of Australia's national anthem.

Whether O'Toole is offering us one meaning or possible versions, in foregrounding alternative versions of reality he is clearly grappling with an important issue for the field which deserves attention. In this thesis, however, it is not my focus, except for the implicit implication it provides. This examination suggests that despite O'Toole's particular position on the dangers of proposing one version of reality in drama as 'the truth', he still uses language that contradicts this intention. This parallels another apparent contradiction between intention and articulation. O'Toole uses the familiar discourse about role as minimal and the teacher-in-role needing to avoid attention seeking, yet constructs roles that arguably at least are not minimalist and demand attention. His current discourse clearly contains residual elements from the traditionally dominant discourse of drama in education.

This examination of function also reinforces my argument that there is no one function of teacher-in-role that is divorced from the aims of the lesson, and therefore, no teacher-in-role function that is any more value-free than the aims. This case study, like the former, confirms my concern that the field of drama education needs to address the issue with more theoretical rigour.

Skills

The skills required to perform O'Toole's different roles were not the same, though there are some commonalities. O'Toole changed his voice and altered his language for the roles and he manipulated the rhythm of the drama. Contrasts between volume, dramatic pace and accent and costume were very much in evidence, as we have seen. It was impossible not to be struck by the theatrical choices being made, and theatrical skills being exhibited at every stage. There was probably a larger use of skills employed by O'Toole when he was in the three named roles than when he was the congress convenor. O'Toole described the two singing roles as 'high level – I wanted to be listened to'. The accents may have taxed many drama teachers because there were so many involved: Australian, upper class English, and Irish. There was also skilful use of mannerisms to signify the role types. Even posture spoke of who the named characters were. Many of these skills, such as selecting specific posture and using accents, are not noted in the literature as required or recommended for a teacher-in-role. These skills are obviously associated with acting, however. Those that are recommended in the literature of the field of drama in education are the same as those identified in O'Neill's work. The list of skills exhibited from the acting list, however, is different because it is much longer.

SKILLS EXHIBITED BY O'TOOLE

Skills employed from the sphere of drama in education	structuring the drama like a dramatist signing through voice communicating through gesture improvisation skills i.e. spontaneity, narration skills, selection of significant parts of the oral text as a playwright listening to the participants responding to the participants
Skills employed from the sphere of acting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) develop and play a character in rehearsals and performances and sustain it before an audience within a framework of a production as directed b) show evidence of the skills of characterisation c) create believable character and emotion appropriate to the demands of the text and production d) define the objectives of a character and embody and express these within the context of a production e) make full use of individuality of performance f) work sensitively with other actors in rehearsal and performance g) show evidence within performance of creative imagination, emotion, thought, concentration and energy h) develop an effective working process and the ability to monitor and evaluate its application i) draw upon and make use of personal experience and observation to assist in the creation of a role j) prepare and sustain the quality of concentration necessary for each performance k) combine acting with singing and/or dancing and other appropriate skills l) use [make-up] costumes and props effectively to develop performance m) communicate to an audience with expression, emotion and spontaneity n) adjust to the demands of different venues and media o) adjust to the nature and reaction of different audiences p) read and interpret texts with accuracy and confidence [Waltzing Matilda] q) identify style and form of writing in order to reveal and express these elements within a performance r) use textual analysis, research and observation in the development of a role t) create and sustain an improvised rehearsal or performance if required with discipline and spontaneity

	u) create and sustain an improvised rehearsal or performance if required with discipline and spontaneity
--	--

The only criteria from the acting list that was not exhibited by O’Toole was

- s) study text, in both prose and verse, and make full use of the structures and phrasing in order to reveal character, intention and the development of a story.

As a result, it is again, difficult to conceive of what O’Toole did in role as other than acting.

Approaches

As the table above implies, much of O’Toole’s language is more reminiscent of theatre than drama in education. The external approaches to role were far more explicit than O’Neill’s with costumes, voice changes, accents, props and large gestures. Hence, I shall consider theatrical antecedents to link his work clearly to trends in acting as well as pedagogy. He has specifically identified his enthusiasm for theatricality in class drama (Appendix 7). I shall first seek precedents for roles such as McCarthy and Sir Herbert. In Section Two I examined different theatrical approaches to role and character so that I can now see if the approaches, too, can be compared.

Actors use different approaches as Callow described regarding *Fanshen* and *Three Sisters*. His performance in *The Mystery of Charles Dickens* included at least twenty different roles. He moved between a narrator, Charles Dickens, and a multitude of Dickens’ characters from his books. The roles were even more diverse than O’Toole’s. Also identified earlier is the difference in the exhibition of skills that goes along with

different approaches to role. Callow as the narrator and O'Toole as the congress convenor concealed the mechanics of performing their roles. George Bernard Shaw expected actors in his plays to conceal any physical exertion or acting feat required to perform the role, given the conventions of the period. Other roles traditionally expose accomplishments of technique and skills. The *zanni* in a commedia performance is expected to make his skills explicit, with deliberate leaps and jumps, sudden movements and acrobatics. O'Toole's caricature of McCarthy and Sir Herbert are similar to those of the commedia character types. These characters are stock characters who make the audience laugh because they are familiar. 'Each character is the representative of a social class which, by the act of theatre, becomes the magical incarnation of all its class' (Boso, 1980, p.9). O'Toole used McCarthy and Herbert to *look at the deep social divisions* and these two become like the commedia characters; 'the magical incarnation of all [their] classes' The students at once recognised the upper class Sir Hubert as a pretentious idiot, and would have filled details of his type in their minds soon after encountering him. Equally, they would recognise the daring and cheeky, carefree McCarthy, who was working for the best from the position of the under-dog.

Sir Herbert resembles the old man, Pantalone, from Commedia dell'arte. He is rich with high status. He is keen to hold onto his wealth and position

Inherent in this attempt to hold on to an old order is Pantalone's influence as a stabilising figure, limiting the world view of Commedia, and thus enabling it to endure whilst bursting at the seams as the young (the Lovers) and the dispossessed (the zanni) eternally attempt a take-over. (Rudlin, 1994, p.92)

Sir Herbert wishes to maintain the status quo, while it is under threat by attempts to dislodge it by the 'dispossessed' sheep shearers, and specifically McCarthy. McCarthy in some respects resembles Arlecchino, 'distinguished from the Zanni by having enough intelligence to hatch schemes' (ibid. p.79). O'Toole is not just building on the stock characters of commedia, he is drawing from a whole theatrical cast of caricatures spawned from commedia. These two caricatures can be found in many different theatre styles. Sir Hubert could be the fop of a comedy in the Restoration Theatre, for example. He would be recognised as quickly as Sir Fopplington Flutter (Vanburgh, 1982[1696]), or Lord Fopington (Etherege, 1970[1676]) However, we cannot identify McCarthy because the theatre of the Restoration does not give low class characters a significant voice. O'Toole is using what is familiar and broadly understood about particular caricature.

Another obvious connection to these roles are those of Brecht. Like Brecht's roles, Sir Herbert and McCarthy could not be analysed psychologically, their characteristics are 'inscribed by their *social actions*' (Counsell, 1996, p.86). The semiotic analysis of a moment of the drama, revealed a moment that fulfils Brecht's concept of *gestus*. This, Counsell explains 'entailed finding performance signs capable of indicating social positions and relationships...in the *gesture*, the actor's action is encoded the gist of the social relationships in which the actors is enmeshed' (ibid.). Sir Herbert's hand gestures were analysed earlier and expose the social relationships he had to both the 'inlaws' and 'outlaws'.

These flamboyant roles of Sir Hubert and McCarthy can be contrasted with the approach taken by O'Toole to play the congress convenor. This approach to role is also comparable to theatrical roles. Unnamed roles are common in political pieces such as *Fanshen* (Hare,

1976, [1947]) and *The Measures Taken* (Brecht, (1977, [1937]) where the social role is what is significant. But the convenor is also setting up the context and giving necessary information for participants' understanding. In this it corresponds to Brecht's 'The Announcer' in *The Resistable Rise of Arturo Ui* (1981, [1941] the storyteller in African theatre who does not need to create a particular personality. Like the congress convenor, the storyteller has a pedagogic role and the responsibility for ensuring aims are accomplished, the storyteller is 'a powerful pedagogic tool for communicating the people's knowledge and wisdom' (Chinyowa, 2001). The congress convenors played by both O'Neill and O'Toole were operating in what Aston and Savona describe as the conventionalised representation since they functioned as a 'sign of the personated character' (1991, p.46). The role players did not merge with the convenor roles in the realistic mode, nor was there any explicit deconstructive representation at play.

O'Toole's diverse roles may be different from O'Neill's, but they are not unfamiliar in theatre. I will now turn to the relationship between teacher and teacher-in-role to identify theatrical comparison. There was a very comfortable moving between teacher as the explainer of the drama, and the teacher as congress convenor. This shift in his position between the professional role (teacher) and fictional character (or role) actually has much precedence in theatre. In the eighteenth century actors would perform with a strong voice, addressing the audience as a whole, then turn to speak more quietly to individual members of the audience when they were not required in the action of the play (Harwood, 1984). The quieter voice and proximity would have signified to the eighteenth century audience that the speaker was now engaging in talk as an actor, rather than as a fictional role. Such distinctions are as readily accepted in the classroom, just as they were in the

Eighteenth century theatrical convention. It would cause problems in illusionist theatre where the actor needs to be seen as the character throughout the performance.

The moment of the leaves of history has been noted because it was *a theatrical moment* and yet it was not within the dramatic fiction. At first I understood this moment as in limbo between teacher and teacher-in-role and could not define it neatly. Examining the moment brings together various points from Section Two. We can identify the moment as social role-playing on the part of a teacher in Goffman's terms, but interestingly, O'Toole found most 'emotional commitment' in this moment of the drama. Although this is a term more often associated with theatrical roles, emotions may well be involved in the performance of social roles and may also require consideration of language and voice, pauses and volume. A best man's speech or a judge's summing up could be emotional and pre-planned, for example, like O'Toole's narrative. While there are some parallels between this moment in the session and acting, it is more appropriate - in terms of our earlier definition of acting as one which requires both a fictional context and an aesthetic dimension - to identify it as an example of performing.

There is a final complexity worth brief consideration. One Ey'd McCarthy and Sir Herbert were both roles of performers in performance. O'Toole, the role player, had to 'perform' with an awareness of his audience in both roles. The 'audience' were, of course, students at one level and 'inlaws' and 'outlaws' at the fictional level. It could be argued that O'Toole had to use *performance*, and *acting* skills in order to play the roles of performers. I include his musical skills as performance. At these points, when the roles were performers, there was a complex web of dramatic action. The *roles* (McCarthy and Sir Herbert) were performing in direct presentational mode being open about their act in

front of their audiences. States would identify these two as working in expressive modes since they were singers displaying their artistry to their audience. At the same time, we must consider the *role player*, O'Toole. He was inviting the students to become part of the fictional hotel bar, and to join the scene by responding to the two performers. He broke 'down the distance between actor and audience...to give the spectator something more than a passive role in the theatre exchange' (1996, p.29). This according to States, is a collaborative model of theatre. Here again, we find the practice of teacher-in-role is clearly described through theatrical theory.

Comment

The comparison of teacher roles and theatrical roles can be extended. In theatre we have seen that different roles require different approaches and in this case study, the same applied to the drama class. Unlike O'Neill, O'Toole believes that role can be highly theatrical and can elaborate on the text, and unlike O'Neill, he plays a host of different types of role.

The difference in practice yet similarity in discourse is an interesting discovery to emerge from this case study. I doubt that it can be argued that in any of the three named roles, O'Toole was not the centre of attention, nor that the roles were minimalist. Indeed, the students clapped after O'Toole finished playing Jack McCann. In these cases, the fiction placed him in front of the participants in his own space at a distance from them.

The semiotic analysis and examination of roles and approaches appear to align O'Toole's work in teacher-in-role very closely to actors' work in a theatrical context. The analysis of function again highlights my scepticism about an 'innocent', value neutral notion of

the function of teacher-in-role which weakens a position arguing that the *function* of teacher-in-role is what distinguishes it from acting. Finally, the case study has revealed a distance between O'Toole's discourse and his practices.

Having examined the work of two leading practitioners, I will now turn to the work of a leading actor. The intention here is to analyse Shaw's interview and practice to enable a thorough comparison between both the articulated views and practice of the actor and teachers. The two drama in education case studies have confirmed that teacher-in-role is not the same for all practitioners. O'Neill and O'Toole operate role differently and both their modes will be examined in the light of Shaw's case study.

FIONA SHAW

A Case Study

Introduction to Fiona Shaw

Given that Fiona Shaw's work might be less known in the field of drama education than that of O'Neill and O'Toole, I will open this case study with a fuller introduction to her background than I have with previous subjects. The information below is gleaned from published interviews and various newspaper and magazine articles. The context below should help ensure that the case study provides a clear concept of an actor's views with which to compare the drama practitioner case studies.

Fiona Shaw was born in Cork in 1958, of an affluent family who enjoyed music and literature. The family were uneasy about her desire to go to drama school, despite her obvious skills. She earned a clutch of drama prizes during her teens but went on to study Philosophy at University College Cork. After this she began her acting training at RADA. Details of her life are important because she believes that an actor's life and performance are drawn together since in their acting 'the history of who you are is in your voice' (Appendix X Interview, 2000).

Indeed, Dominic Cavendish noted 'When she talks ... you see the former philosophy student – rational, intellectually inquisitive and as nervily alert off-stage as on' (The Daily Telegraph, 15th January, 2001). Shaw maintains association with the academy because, as well as receiving an honorary doctorate from the National University of Ireland, she is Honorary Professor of Drama Studies at Trinity College Dublin.

Shaw is unashamedly pro high culture perhaps most evident when she says, *But I have nothing against popular culture* (Shaw, cited in Oddey, 1999, p.158) and then goes on to continue speaking about weighty plays. Cavendish states that 'she has little time for contemporary playwrights' (2001). She eulogises over the language of the classics and deems *The Wasteland* 'the best text I have ever done, I suppose' (Interview, appendix X 2000). She is concerned about what she sees as a growing fragmentation of language and clearly sees it as a downward step. She argues that by the beginning of the twentieth century, America ...*due to its multinational mix...had a tendency towards the noun. People would stop using the filigree language of the 18th or 19th Century, because people would come from all over the world going: 'coffee', or 'pizza', 'car', 'money'...*(Shaw, 1999 p158)

In conversation about Shakespeare on BBC Radio 3, there is a glimpse of her view of deterioration again:

...because what we call the deconstruction of our moral universe – a world where God is dead or a world where language itself has become fragmentary – means that the art of acting has become a mirrored fragmentation. Actors are often used as in films, to just play a tiny fragment of a story, that itself is telling us something about the human state of affairs. (Shaw, 1999 p158)

Clearly, Shaw recognises the post-modern context of fragmentation, but seems not to wish to be involved in its representation. Whilst there are some notable exceptions such as the recent film, *Harry Potter* (which she was moving on to after *Medea*) and a few television programmes, Shaw prefers the classics and prefers live theatre.

She is excited by the *dynamic between actor and the audience of stage performance*, enjoying the sense of the audience and its effect on that performance. *When you ask me why I do all this, all I know is that it's something to do with rendering. The only way you can get to render yourself is to render everything you know, and the only way you can get to that hopefully is on the terrible challenge of courting failure.* (Shaw in Oddey, 1999 p 157) Shaw claims to thrive on the feeling of danger and the risk that is endemic in public performance. In the theatre she senses a raw exhilaration of knowing it is happening in the here and now as nothing can be changed once it has occurred. The exhilaration she feels from this is exacerbated by the anxiety she feels before she opens in a new show. When explaining her throat problem in New York before the opening of *The Wasteland* she says:

On the morning of the show, I woke up as I always do before first nights, in the warlike state of being an actor. It's always terrifying, a bit of Gethsemane, an entirely self-inflicted misery, when you do battle with yourself. The fear is so awful, it makes people catatonic and sick, and causes mouths to dry up on stage. (The Sunday Times, October, 2001)

Originally earning a reputation for comic work, particularly in the classics, Shaw found that her performance in *Electra* in 1982 changed her working life. She won the Olivier

Award for best actress and her performance was recently described by Jennifer Wallace in The Times Higher Educational Supplement as one in 'which the audience was moved to tears' (*TES 2000*). This audience response was surpassed this year when members of the audience were apparently fainting and vomiting in response to her portrayal of the title role in Euripedes' *Medea* (Kellaway, The Observer Review, 21st January, 2001).

Shaw performed *Hedda Gabler* in Dublin at The Abbey Theatre as well as in London during 1993. It was later televised. Her approach to the role helps us to understand her approach to her work as an actor. Shaw unearths complexities and sees them as quite straightforward. Hence she manages to create a believably neurotic Hedda who is so often played as simply hard and manipulative. She took Hedda's words, 'I am a coward' as the key words to her understanding of the character (cited in Zucker, 1999, p.165) This led her to see a vulnerable Hedda, and worse, as one who knows she is continually making mistakes. Her breathy, often stammering performance signed the insecurities, hesitation and impulsiveness she found in the character. In her words, she sought out the spots of helplessness, of fear and of inadequacy in Hedda. *It's so uninteresting to judge her as a hard-hearted woman who has all the power.* (ibid. p165)

Shaw's Hedda came about through a fusion between the text and her own life. She claimed to have learnt much about her grandparents and drawn, for her role, on some of her mother's gestures. Her own life seems to have evolved in her work almost taking her by surprise. Although she doesn't take to the character approach that has been Stanislavski's legacy, she talks of *experiencing the event*.

So, you put yourself in the situation, and you'll discover your character. You don't have a character that walks into the situation. You can't know your character, in fact. You're just you.

(ibid. p160)

Shaw sees the process of preparing for a role as highly instinctive,

So really, the best actors in the world are those who are often rather simple about what they do: they just do it, they don't plan it or organise it or manipulate it, they just are it. It's very near what Peter Brook says about language, it's to find out what it does for you, and not what you do to it.

(ibid. p157)

Evidently, Shaw enjoys challenges, seeks the complex, and wants to portray emotion. *I'll do anything that's dangerous. I have a mortal terror of boredom.* (Shaw in Oddey, 1999 p.157) She loved performing *The Waste Land* in an old porn cinema on 42nd street, New York. The lighting consisted of only bare light bulbs and there was plastic sheeting over the rows of chairs which were not being used. Preparing her first directing job of a tour of *Widowers' Houses* in late 1999, Shaw found it difficult to make much sense of a play which begins as romantic comedy, and then suddenly changes into an angry indictment of landlords who shamelessly exploit the poor, (Croall, 1999 p.7). She was delighted after a studio read through to find that it was *more emotional than it appears on the page*. Shaw said,

As with Ibsen, you need to find the play beneath the play, to get at that godless, unpoetic world where there's a seeming domestic situation, but something much more epic going

on underneath ... What made Widowers' Houses at all approachable to her was just this: Shaw's protective tone conceals a much messier underbelly, and a violence hinted at in certain scenes. I look forward to investigating that. (ibid.).

Since the field work for this case study, Fiona Shaw won the Evening Standard best actor award for her performance in *Medea*.

CONTEXT OF OBSERVATION

When	20 th June, 2000
With whom	Royal National Youth Theatre group who knew each other well
Duration	1 hours 40 minutes
Where	The Abbey Theatre, Dublin
Participant numbers & age	Full theatre of 628 seats. Range of ages from early twenties onwards.
Gender/ethnic mix	Mixed gender, mainly white Irish audience.
Space	Large theatre with tiered seating. The set spilled out from the raised stage, so that actors could enter from steps at the front of the auditorium.
Experience	The audience were likely to be regular attenders since membership of the theatre is significant at The Abbey.
Knowledge of leader	Shaw was presented as Ireland's own star in the publicity posters and programme. Probably many in the theatre knew a lot about her life and career.

PLAY OUTLINE

The play opens with an explanation by the nurse of what has gone before. An understanding of the past is important to appreciate the action that is to take place in *Medea*. We learn that Medea, with special powers, is the daughter of a barbarian king. She helped Jason and his Argonauts to recover the Golden Fleece, and then fled with him to Corinth, leaving her native Colchis. In love with Jason, to aid their escape, Medea

killed her brother and tricked the daughters of a usurping king into boiling their father alive. The nurse explains that, having done all of this for Jason, he has now abandoned her for the young daughter of King Creon. The nurse is afraid of Medea's reaction. Medea is hurt and angry, and full of violent speech.

Medea does not conceal her anger, and fearful of what she may do, Creon tells her that she and her sons must leave Corinth that very day. She begs for one more day. During this day she arranges asylum for her future with King Aegeus in Athens, and begs Jason to ask the princess to keep and care for their sons. She then sends a present of a poisoned dress to the princess who is killed along with her father.

After much anguished hesitation, Medea kills her own sons to complete her revenge on Jason. She argues over their bodies with Jason before leaving him bereft of wife, regal father-in-law, status and sons, and flees to Athens.

SEMIOTIC ANALYSIS OF PERFORMANCE

When exploring the semiotic features of the drama teachers, I compared their teacher-in-role with the role they presented as teacher. In the case of Shaw, I must compare her role as Medea with the actor she presented to me when we met. This slightly alters the implication of the table because when in role as teachers speaking to their classes, O'Neill and O'Toole were aware of a large group and their other role as the leader of the session. When I spoke to Shaw, she had only me to address and had no responsibility for the interview. The grid below attempts to highlight the distinctions between the Shaw who presented herself to me in the interview, and the Shaw who presented herself to an

audience at The Abbey Theatre. The role of Medea was, of course, more varied than that of Shaw on interview, but I will draw upon tendencies I identified throughout the performance.

Personas

Transmitters	Shaw in interview	Medea
Oral text	Clear; lines overlapped, interrupted with additional ideas adding to meaning	McLeish translation: direct, and clear, retaining the poetic rhythm
Paralinguistic features	Moderate volume, low pitch and very fast. Use of intonation. Irish accent	Huge variety in volume, rhythm and pitch. Often breathy and gasping. Irish accent
Kinesic factors	Minimal gesture. Use of hands and movements of the head	Huge variety of large gestures eg playing-often violently-with toys, running about, waving arms up to the skies, roughing her sons' hair repeatedly, holding a fixed gesture such as sitting head in hands.
Proxemic relations	On a chair opposite me with a table between us. She put her feet up on the chair beside her, filling more space.	On a raised stage with a distance maintained between audience and actor. Spatial relationships with others varied, from close enough to hug, kiss or kill, to isolated moments of isolation. She used every part of the designated space.
Vestimentary codes	Shorts, tee shirt and trainers	Elegant, heeled black court shoes with a simple v-necked black dress. A cardigan was worn at the beginning but was soon taken off as the drama developed.
Properties	None	Toys lay about the stage that Shaw used. At one stage she burnt a teddy bear.

Some brief points of decoding are required. The exaggerated gestures and use of space contributed to the depth of the tragedy, to the build up of tension, and to the poetic language of the translation. The early removal of the cardigan symbolised a removal of

constraint. At this early stage it communicated what she was both capable of and prepared to fulfil. It had a similar effect to the act of rolling up sleeves in its sense of preparedness, but it carried this more powerful energy of removing what might hold her back. The toys scattered about the performance space reasserted the innocence and vulnerability of the children, while the toy sailing boat that floated constantly in the square pool was a constant reminder of the ship, *Argos*, and therefore all that Medea had done for Jason.

The moment selected for close scrutiny comes towards the end of the speech in which Medea deliberates about whether or not she can go through with her plan for revenge. She eventually succeeds in talking herself into the action.

Theatrical communication in a moment of drama

	<i>Encoding of meaning</i>			<i>Decoding of meaning</i>		
Source of information	Oral text	Paralinguistic register	Kinesic factors	Meaning	Intention	Desired audience reaction
Shaw	‘I must kill the children quickly and be gone.’	Steady rhythm, no pauses, smooth enunciation. Deliberately spoken	Stroking lower stomach in a circling motion.	I feel the pain of knowing these children are of this womb. I feel my motherhood.	To demonstrate the killer is not without feeling – is still a mother –not a heartless monster	To look and be angry at what has pushed a loving mother to this

The table highlights the complexity of the moment. The lines are of death, yet the action is stroking the womb which is the preparation for life. The words are spoken with determination and strength, yet with the stroking of the stomach reveal a vulnerability. There is murderous intention in front of our eyes, yet we are encouraged to see the blame elsewhere. It is the juxtaposition of the oral text and the action that creates the

contradictions that in turn problematise a simple verdict of guilty. I have chosen this moment for analysis, because I could argue that it acts as a microcosm of this Deborah Warner production.

THE INTERVIEW

Shaw spoke at length about the play and its relevance to our society. She explained her defensiveness of Medea, the wronged woman, and drew contemporary parallels and identified implicit contemporary questions raised in this production. I have, however, for the purpose of this thesis, selected the parts of the interview in which she expresses her view of acting. In addition to Medea, she refers to her solo performance of *The Wasteland*.

To explain her concept of acting, Shaw drew my attention to the two children who performed in the production and told me about how they had been selected from the children auditioned. What was sought in children is important for Shaw in adult actors, too.

Children are a very good template for saying perhaps everything about what acting might be. As soon as a child says "well I put my hands through my hair and was blind" they have been corrupted somehow, like Adam and Eve! They've lost this thing. Really, acting is the opposite, it's about reacting, it's about being, so it's about listening, it's about responding and therefore fundamentally changing nightly. The worry about any pattern of learned behaviour is it's dead when it's connected to text

She added that the children used in the play *were not needy*, they did not need to feel the attention of the audience or the other actors, *they just seem to be rather robust members of humanity, lucky possibly!* I wondered if it had anything to do with skill,

Oh no no! In fact, it will be healthy to not have skills.

When it comes to murder, no there is no gesture. I think gesture's the killer actually; a gesture follows a thought - the thought leads.

It's their innocence that is the thing that gets caught the minute they start doing innocent acting.

The boys are emblematic in this play. They aren't real people, but will have to signify something – they have to represent the perfect boys, lovely sons, committed sons

I asked how this compared to what actors do.

I think adults are drawing on their experience or their imaginative experience as it's meant to be, if experience, and what is very tricky about adult acting is that the history of your voice is in your voice, the history of who you are is in your voice, people with big lives make potentially very good actors. People who have an imaginative ability to transform ordinary experience into something poetical or theatrical.

Shaw spoke about different types of role, distinguishing between social and professional roles and the role of Medea in the play. She moves from these roles to her role as the actor.

You are playing the role of interviewer now but you also are the interviewer now, I mean, whether you play it or not, you could say "well for this interview I think I had better wear a three piece suit" - you would be heightened in both sense of role, but as you are just wearing a tee shirt, you think 'well, I just am the interviewer'. I think our theatre is getting much nearer that where it is in a second if I asked you a lot of questions, there might be a query from the outside as to which one of us was the interviewer. That would be my hijacking the role of interviewer, wouldn't it? There is a role in Medea, but the function of the role... I don't know what it is. I mean it's not to carry any message. It is to release Medea as my role. As an actress my role is to release the role of Medea.

In discussing actor audience relationships she said that:

there are some very unfortunate actors who so ignore audience - they don't perform for them. I've seen some actors here making decisions about 'I don't really want to come out from behind this thing', but if you don't come out from behind this thing, you've lost sight of for whom you are doing it'.

She herself feels that at the back of your mind you are absolutely in conversation with the audience. I asked about a particular moment in the performance when Medea apologises to Jason and attempts to persuade him to beg the princess to keep their children and take them to the palace. The audience know her plot. Shaw played with her hands and stepped from one foot to the other. These signified the deceit to the audience *outside* the fiction, but at the same time signified an attempt to convince Jason *within* the dramatic action.

Yes, it was obvious that I was not really being true, but actually it's the same stress, I didn't even know I was doing that. But isn't it about also, if Jason saw the hand movement, far from thinking 'there's a fast one being pulled here' he might think 'she's in trouble because it's hard for her to say this'. So the signal is one thing to him, but something else to you.

Regarding deceit and the role of the actor, Shaw explained,

Cicely Berry always says the thing about texts, is that it is as easy to lie as to tell the truth, but of course, actually all acting is lying ... I am Medea. There's a truth in that.

I asked Shaw about playing Richard II.

It was very hard. I didn't expect it to be so hard. It wasn't eventually; eventually I did male for a year, you wear down the boundary but initially I was just asking them to do something that I didn't believe. It was only at the beginning, it wasn't really about the entire play. It was just really hard to come on, say those words (because the audience make an instant decision in about 10 seconds) in that first 10 seconds.

I wondered how Shaw might compare what she did when performing *Medea* to what she did when presenting/reading 'The Wasteland.' Her answer extends her earlier point about the relationship between what is going on in her head and what is experienced by the audience. Unlike acting in *Medea*, acting in *The Wasteland*

was life. I mean I had invented each of the stories for each little section/line. So, "April is the cruellest month" was a woman called Mrs Burney in my mind talking to my mother.

"I go south in winter" was a film director I worked with. I wondered if he'd recognise himself. Acting is not about words really, its about the freedom, its about action and its about the three dimensions of those words, but people say the words do it, of course they don't, its what you feel about the words that does it, its your imagination and even if you never believe it. If you think imaginatively enough the words will come off that colour - that's the miracle of it. You know, if you think that the orange juice is a bomb; if you call it the orange juice and you're thinking 'bomb', it changes the word. It's all about investment. So I've done a lot of work and we rehearsed it in Belgium in a house - we weren't given a rehearsal room. We were doing it for a festival. Because we were in a house, Deborah and I discovered the poem was absolutely about domestic things. Of course, it was about what ever you want it to be about.

She said she was watching it like a movie in front of her eyes. I wondered if a literary scholar would have read it differently.

I'm not even interpreting it. I am responding to it. and I am not expecting my response to it to be yours. I respond to it, explode it in a way that I hope will explode quite differently in your mind. A literary scholar is telling you - is doing what I am doing, but telling you that is the truth. [I'm making] it occur so it is alive. That's all. I'm making it alive. Once it's alive the meanings jump off. Not to look for meanings is the thing.

Shaw was pleased to play a character again, in *Medea*.

In 'Medea' there is a chance to play a person. It is the past. The real play is the story of a fantastic journey, fantastic falling in love and a woman who loves too much, and an

absolute self-sacrifice; giving up everything for somebody which isn't really her fault and something she never takes on in the play. She says 'it's you started it', in fact she should never, ever - and she says that herself, "I should never have left my home" - but also "I should have never killed my brother". I mean, there are certain things that you should not do for another person...These things are where our emotions still do lie and if we can take the consequence and make it clear in a sympathetic way. So it's a different exercise to 'The Wasteland'.

ANALYSIS OF INTERVIEW

The interview can be analysed in terms of what Shaw sees as significant in acting, and what she deems inappropriate in acting. Some of the points on the table below she explains explicitly, and some are read as implicit.

Shaw interview: Good Acting

SHAW'S VIEW	EVIDENCE
Acting is being in the moment and responding to what comes	<i>It's about reacting; it's about being; so it's about listening; it's about responding and therefore fundamentally changing nightly</i>
Not repeated patterns or learnt behaviour	<i>The worry about any pattern of learned behaviour is it's dead when it's connected to text</i>
Instinctive physical responses to intellectual activity	<i>I think gesture's the killer actually; a gesture follows a thought – the thought leads</i>
Making use of personal or imagined experiences	<i>I think adults are drawing on their experience or their imaginative experience</i>
More enriched by lived experience	<i>People with big lives are potentially very good actors</i>
Transforming the ordinary into the poetic or theatrical	<i>People who have an imaginative ability to transform ordinary experience into something poetical or theatrical</i>

Releasing the fictional role	<i>As an actress my role is to release the role of Medea</i>
A performance for the benefit of the audience	<i>If you don't come out from behind this thing, you've lost sight of for whom you are doing it</i>
A relationship with the audience which can enable communication to take place between character and audience, even behind the back of other characters. It is therefore a duality of performance, operating for both the other roles and for the audience	<i>The signal is one thing to him [Jason], but something else to you [the audience]</i>
A deceit	<i>Actually, all acting is lying</i>
Having to believe what you expect the audience to believe. Approaching the role with conviction	<i>Re. the audience accepting her role as Richard II; initially I was asking them to do something that I didn't believe</i>
More than words. It is the conviction and investment that creates belief beyond words or objects themselves	<i>Acting is not about words really. It's about freedom; it's about action and it's about the three dimensions of these words...if you think imaginatively enough the words will come off that colour-that's the miracle of it. If you think that the orange juice is a bomb; if you call it the orange juice and you're thinking 'bomb', it changes the word. It's all about investment</i>

This table makes it very clear that acting requires response to what is taking place, and that it is not regurgitating what has been planned. A fresh performance each night implies a very close communication with the audience and with other actors. Gestures are not predetermined, they move from thought. Learnt behaviour on stage is deemed the death of the action. In the table above, I described this as being ‘in the moment’. This is a phrase used frequently by Johnstone who coined the term ‘playing in the moment’. The fact that Johnstone’s term was applied to improvisation provides an interesting dimension on Shaw’s view of acting. She expresses in the interview a notion of acting as fresh and re-created, rather than learnt and delivered.

The interview also draws a very close relationship between mental investment and what is communicated to an audience. The implication is that if the actor believes in what she is doing, the audience will also believe it. The mental commitment is more important than specific acting skills. Shaw does not refer to acting skills, and dismissed them categorically in relation to child performers. What is crucial, which is perhaps more than a learnt skill, is the ability to transform the everyday into something 'artistic'. Shaw did not explain what she meant by this, but I propose she was referring to what we considered in Section Two, the conscious way of making an action significant that makes it a theatrical act, rather than a social act.

'Acting has its own coherent body of statements that similarly produce a self-confirming account of the reality of the acting process'. The discourse Shaw has drawn upon clearly makes assumptions about me (her audience) and involves concepts set up with which to analyse acting. This discourse appears to be a particular discourse that is prevalent among contemporary actors, and provides a stark contrast to Mamet's which is far more down to earth. Shaw's lines 'Being a performer is not a job, it's a philosophy, and it is an alternative life in a way to the structured life of ordinary people' (cited in Oddey, 1999, p.153) highlight the discourse and its distinction from Mamet's examined earlier in Section Two.

Shaw explains that her function as an actress is to *release the role of Medea*. This phrase needs a brief examination. The idea of a character being released seems to suppose that there is an existing character to be released. This cuts against the common view of a character being constructed through the interaction between text, actor, production and audience interpretation (Aston & Savona, 1991). It also conflicts with the production

itself. This production derived from a particular feminist position. Shaw spoke of her defensiveness of Medea. It presented a different Medea from Eileen Hurley's 'archetypal woman scorned' at The Globe in 1948, and from Diana Rigg's award winning performance of 1996. These women have released 'Medeas' rather than 'Medea'. Indeed, in the interview Shaw explained that her interpretation in acting roles will not be the same as others' interpretations.

I think adults are drawing on their experience or their imaginative experience and what is very tricky about adult acting is that the history of your voice is in your voice. The history of who you are is in your voice. People with big lives make potentially very good actors.

As one outside the actor's discourse, I find myself challenging some of the notions of acting that Shaw offers. I am not convinced that *the history of who you are is in your voice*, nor how this is squared with a view that *people with big lives make potentially very good actors*, since those big lives will be carried in their voices and may therefore restrict their range. This somewhat complex claim about adult actors goes against her notion of children as a template for acting. Shaw described the strength of an innocent acting style that allows thought to lead gesture and enables the freedom to respond and react. Big lives making good actors seems to be a direct contrast to the uncorrupted, pre Adam and Eve idea of good acting. Shaw herself alludes to the fact that what she describes appears to be without solid rationality: *If you think imaginatively enough the words will come off that colour - that's the miracle of it.*

CONTEXTUALISING THE CASE STUDY

Early in this thesis I proposed that there is a particular view of theatre (as identified in Neelands) that has led to a particular perception of acting. I suggested that this view of acting has contributed to the assertion that teacher-in-role is not acting. I then presented many examples of alternative forms of theatre with different acting conventions. These examples, I suggested, blurred the established boundaries between teacher-in-role and acting. They included improvisatory theatre and participatory theatre. This case study provides an example of a theatre form far removed from educational drama. It fulfils the criteria for the traditional model, without audience participation, without improvisation, and with no application to a specific context with intended outcomes. In research terms, then, I set out to give myself the biggest challenge by distancing the form of theatre as far away as possible, conceptually, at least, from drama in education.

The case study of Shaw was intended to create an acting profile with which to compare the teachers' case studies, so I will take the opportunity in this section to draw upon theoretical concerns that have arisen from the two earlier case studies. Having looked at both Contexts and Audience Relationships, Functions and Aims, 'Skills' and Approaches more briefly than before, I shall consider the three subjects' 'Views on Acting' and the 'Role of the teacher/actor in the drama event' which spans all areas of our theoretical consideration.

Contexts and Audience Relationships

I saw Shaw as Medea in large theatre venues, The Abbey Theatre in Dublin and Queens in London. Walking into such spaces, expectations are of a silent audience, and a

performance that operates in a space removed from the audience in some way, usually a raised stage. These expectations were fulfilled in Warner's production. The audience expected to be entertained even though most will have been aware that it might be a 'heavy' entertainment. While the production brought some unexpected humour, these expectations were also fulfilled. While some audience members might have been interested to learn about a Greek myth, it is unlikely that the majority expected to have a learning experience, but a thought-provoking, emotional one.

Shaw saw the play as very important to its audience:

We need tragedy at the moment. We're living in very confusing times. We're losing by the moment the power of debate. "Medea" is pertinent to all of us at the moment. People do kill their children. This play asks, "How can this happen?" As a society, we like to believe that children come first. They absolutely don't. Adult relationships come first. Passion comes first. (cited in Cavendish, 2001)

Perhaps her expectations for the play were slightly different than the audience's. There is a hint of the preacher or teacher in Shaw's words above.

In terms of contexts and audience relationships, then, this dramatic encounter is very different from the previous two and would suggest that Shaw and the teachers are doing very different things. The differences include: a silent audience; separate audience and performance space; very large audiences; no personal familiarity with the actor; no familiarity with most of those in the auditorium; an audience of mixed age groups; an audience who had different reasons for being in the theatre seats (whereas the previous

groups shared motives). The only aspect of similarity is the desire of the actor, like the teachers', to communicate about an issue that she believes is important.

Functions and Aims

It has become clear that Shaw took on the role with a commitment to the challenge she thought it would give her. Although she believed that this production had particular aims, *her* aim was obviously to succeed in that challenge. From the interviews with Warner and Shaw cited earlier, the aim for the production appears to have been to begin a debate about how it can happen that parents kill their children. Hence, a highly sympathetic Medea is portrayed. Let us examine the functions.

Functions of the drama

The function of the actor	'to liberate the role'
The function of the actor in role	to bring about sympathy for Medea, the child killer
The function of the role	To bring about the tragedy. For Propp, Medea would be 'the dispatcher'.

The function of the actor is inevitably caught up with the aim. To bring about a debate about child killers, the actor had to depict Medea as a mother *driven* to kill her sons, so that rather than see her as a 'child killer' she is seen as a woman driven by cruelty; a victim of Jason. In the table I have provided Shaw's view of the actor's function. It may otherwise be seen as finding the complexities of a character and the way to create an appropriate portrayal in the context of the given production. Shaw's suggestion that her function is to 'liberate a role' assumes that there is a particular role to be liberated and we thus see the same sort of assumption masquerading as consensus as we have in the earlier case studies. This will be considered further below. Again, it is difficult to distinguish between the character and the function of the character. Medea's actions determine what

we perceive of her character, and at the same time, her actions are what generate the unfolding tragic inevitability.

Skills

Looking at the skills identified in the literature of drama in education, Shaw shows differently from the two teachers. The points in bold are those Shaw did exhibit, and those in italics represent those which could be conceptualised in her work. If ‘participants’ is interpreted as the co actors as children might be in a classroom drama, then Shaw, too, employed those skills. Two skills that I could not identify are those concerned with the creation of the piece and the text prior to the dramatic event. Warner implies that Shaw was part of the development of the piece, ‘She pushes me to places I wouldn’t otherwise go. She inspires trust and there has to be trust there for you to freefall without a parachute. She also has an enormous appetite balanced by being a visceral performer’ (cited in Smurthwaite, 2000). This suggests that Shaw played a part on the development of the performance, but she did not have overall responsibility in the way both education practitioners did.

SKILLS EXHIBITED BY SHAW

Skills employed from the sphere of drama in education	structuring the drama like a dramatist signing through voice communicating through gesture improvisation skills i.e. spontaneity, narration skills, selection of significant parts of the oral text as a playwright listening to the participants responding to the participants
Skills employed from the sphere of acting	<ul style="list-style-type: none">a) <i>develop and play a character in rehearsals and performances and sustain it before an audience within the framework of a production as directed</i>b) <i>show evidence of skills of characterisation</i>c) <i>create believable character and emotion appropriate to the demands of the text and production</i>d) <i>define the objectives of a character and embody and express these within the context of a production</i>e) <i>make full use of individuality in performance</i>f) <i>work sensitively with other actors in rehearsal and performance</i>g) <i>show evidence within performance of creative imagination, emotion, thought, concentration and energy</i>h) <i>develop an effective working process and the ability to monitor and evaluate its application</i>i) <i>draw upon and make use of personal experience and observation to assist in the creation of role</i>j) <i>prepare and sustain the quality of concentration necessary for each performance</i>l) <i>use make-up, costumes and props effectively to develop performance</i>m) <i>communicate to an audience with expression, emotion and spontaneity</i>n) <i>adjust to the demands of different venues and media</i>p) <i>read and interpret text with accuracy and confidence</i>s) <i>study text, in both prose and verse, and make full use of the structures and phrasing in order to reveal character, intention and the development of a story</i>u) <i>create and sustain an improvised rehearsal or performance if required with discipline and spontaneity</i>

The number of skills exhibited from the acting list is extensive, like O'Toole's, and to a slightly lesser extent, O'Neill's.

All three also operated the rhythm and pace of the drama in which they took part. Given that so many of the skills listed are relevant to all three case study subjects, the distinction between the two activities again, becomes difficult to sustain.

Approaches

It is clear from what Shaw has said, as well as from her performance, that she had been through a mental preparation for this role. That internal process that Morgan and Saxton speak of was evident and seemed more significant than external considerations. No special walks or voices were adopted, but Shaw's gestures and expression communicated the internal turmoil. Just as Shaw explained, her approach to the role was to ensure thought led to gesture, rather than the other way around, so the external features appeared a result of the internal state.

We saw in Section Two that States identifies one mode of performance as 'self-expressive'. The example of roles that invited this type of performance included Medea, and in some senses, Shaw's artistry did indeed become the focus of audience attention. His description 'we react to the actor's particular way of doing this role' (1996, p.22) fits my experience in the audience. However, I am also aware of the relevance of States' descriptions of his 'representational mode' to Shaw's performance. As much as Shaw's performance was mesmerising, so too, was the content of the play, and so it 'is now an enactment of significant human experience ... the virtuosity now lies in the power of the subject, the collaboration in the mutual agreement by actor and audience on the value and

appropriateness of the subject to the community of men’ (1996, p.35). While admiring Shaw’s skill in the role, I also moved in and out of seeing her merge (as Callow described it, appendix 2) into Medea, the role. It seems that there was some conflict at play. On the one hand, the play itself promotes a self-expressive mode with Aston and Savona’s notion of the personated character prevalent in the classic texts of ancient Greece. On the other hand, Shaw’s performance did not invite a distinction between actor and role. Again, distinctions prove difficult. Shaw’s performance does not neatly fulfil the theoretical classifications.

Views of acting

O’Neill made distinctions between teacher-in-role and acting. I have selected the main points and compared them with Shaw’s view of acting in the table below. When set alongside Shaw’s notion of acting, O’Neill’s distinctions do not appear to hold. Given that Shaw’s *Medea* represents a conventional theatre form and acting style, her view should comply with O’Neill’s description of acting if it is on firm theoretical ground. But it does not. In fact, what actually emerge are profound similarities between O’Neill’s view of teacher-in-role and Shaw’s view of acting.

Relating two views: O’Neill and Shaw

O’NEILL’S VIEW OF TIR & ACTING SHAW’S VIEW OF ACTING

TIR responds to what is given, improvises and is therefore not fixed by a script, as an actor is	Acting is about responding and listening and therefore the performance will change nightly
TIR avoids seeking attention, but acting demands to be the focus of attention	Specifically argues for children who are not ‘needy’ of attention (children are a ‘template’ for acting). They should not demand attention
TIR maintains a distance from the role. An actor embodies the role.	Shaw is critical of actors who forget that their priority is to perform for an audience, so the role does not take over this primary

	aim. She implies some distance. Shaw also speaks of signing to the audience and to other characters which suggests a remove from embodying the character.
TIR works through representation while an actor becomes the character	<i>The boys are emblematic in this play. They aren't real people, but will have to signify something – they have to represent the perfect boys, lovely sons, committed sons</i>
Unlike acting, TIR is functional	The function of the actor is <i>to liberate the role</i> . The role is played in a production that has a particular feminist position, which implies a particular function for the role of Medea. She functions to bring sympathy for her position and anger against Jason's. She functions as the protagonist, who fulfils the tragedy
TIR is simple, but acting is elaborate and complex	Acting requires an innocence likened to before the corruption of Adam and Eve. Shaw admires simple portrayal - <i>I think gesture is the killer, actually</i>

Having demonstrated similarities between O'Neill's view of teacher-in-role and Shaw's view of acting, it must also be acknowledged that in some respects O'Neill's conception of teacher-in-role differs from what Shaw does. But O'Neill is just one theorist. We can now turn to see how O'Toole's view of teacher-in-role relates to Shaw's view of acting.

In the table below, I present O'Toole's list of possibilities for teacher-in-role in the left hand column. In the next two columns I identify the degree to which O'Neill and Shaw comply with O'Toole's possibilities. 'Agree' denotes that the point has been articulated or revealed in practice. 'Disagree' means that the point has been opposed in the interview or not been carried out in practice. Interestingly, there is a little discrepancy in terms of the degree to which Shaw admires minimalism in the interview, yet does not play a minimalist role as Medea.

Relating three views: O'Toole, O'Neill & Shaw

O'Toole on teacher-in-role	O'Neill on teacher-in-role	Shaw on acting
Can use costume	disagree	agree
Can use properties	disagree	agree
Can use space theatrically	disagree	agree
Can involve emotional commitment	disagree	agree
Can be a character	disagree	agree
Should not draw attention	agree	agree
Played in a minimalist way	agree	Disagree (performance was not minimalist)

The table is interesting because it suggests that paradoxically O'Toole's notion of teacher-in-role is closer to Shaw's notion of acting, than it is to O'Neill's view of teacher-in-role. This table supports the argument that the practices of teacher-in-role are plural rather than monolithic. If we were to analyse particular roles, we would find different results. O'Toole's congress convenor was very like O'Neill's congress convenor, but he played a range of roles that were very different.

So O'Neill's view of acting is not shared by Shaw. However, her view of teacher-in-role has some similarities with Shaw's notion of acting. O'Toole's view of teacher-in-role goes a large step closer to Shaw's view of acting. While one of his roles is very close to O'Neill's, his other roles are theoretically closer to Shaw's view of acting.

Role of actor and teacher in drama event

It may be argued that the distinctions between the kind of input made by actor and teacher are so different that the comparisons have limitations. Earlier I considered the additional roles that are often ascribed to the teacher in the overall drama event, such as director and playwright. Indeed, I pointed out that despite these theatrical roles being identified as part of teacher-in-role, acting is not mentioned.

Let us look at each one at a time. Firstly, did Shaw have any influence on the overall production in a directorial sense? Deborah Warner, who directed *Medea*, is a friend of Shaw and they have worked together many times. 'They say they only do plays they don't know how to do' (Smurthwaite, 2001 p.20). This implies a joint endeavour and a shared responsibility for the piece. This does not mean that Warner is opting out of her directorial responsibilities, but an indication that she represents the contemporary commitment to a more ensemble approach to the production. Hitchcock, like Mamet, would not have expected his leading actor to interfere with what he saw as his responsibility, but Warner clearly expects contributions and experimentation with the actors. 'Warner ... says Shaw is much cleverer than she is "which makes her a great person to have in the rehearsal room"' (ibid.). I suggest that since the actor may have an eye to the direction of a piece of drama, she may, like the teacher be thinking of more than her own role presentation. We have noted earlier that Shaw's performance is an example of a tradition production and that other theatre pieces will have been constructed even more collaboratively.

The second issue concerns the scripted nature of Shaw's performance. She worked from McLeish's translation of Euripides' text. O'Neill suggested that she worked from a script at the beginning of her drama in that she knew what she was going to say. She thought that later she responded to what was offered by the participants therefore changed the way she replied to them. O'Toole also responds to what he is given by participants. In this sense, both 'devised' their own 'dramas' and both had taught them many times before my observation, so they knew their scripts and they had experience of the possible responses from the participants. I wonder how much variety there is in the way they respond in role.

I have asked two drama practitioners who experienced the same dramas about what took place. The differences do not seem considerable, and I know that I have taught the same drama with occasionally very different developments, but usually, similar ones. They both were playwrights in that they planned the dramas and gave consideration to the sort of language they should use to generate the context. It has been argued that teachers-in-role are also writing as they go, because of the need to respond to the moment.

Shaw, like the teachers-in-role, works from a text. It happens that the script was not her own. Once she is acting and the teachers are in role, I am not sure that it matters who wrote the script. Some of the classroom dialogue may well be written in improvisation as the teacher responds to the participants. But, Shaw claims a similar concern with response as do the teachers: *acting is about reacting, it's about being, so it's about listening, it's about responding and therefore fundamentally changing nightly*. Shaw, too, anticipates being flexible and believes, as the teachers do, that the performances change each time.

Whatever the distinctions between the degree to which the 'texts' were pre-planned, a key commonality is that each of the case study subjects have created performance texts. Furthermore, each describe a processual concept of that performance text and expect to respond in the moment, and expect to change and develop in their roles during each 'performance'. This takes us to the heart of another opposition in drama in education. The process and product dichotomy emerges as insignificant in the light of Shaw's explanation of her work. For the actor, as well as for the teachers, there is no sense of a final, a completed dramatic encounter. Reforming and reshaping is part of the event for future occasions. There is no finality in their concepts of the event that makes it only a

‘product’. If each ‘performance’ is part of the on-going process, these oppositional boundaries blur.

Though other theatrical forms may be closer to the teacher-in-role led drama of the classroom, it is impossible to avoid similarities. Actor and teachers in these case studies have both been concerned with the overall drama, and both have spoken at least to some degree, to a pre-planned script, and both see themselves responding in the moment and adjusting their roles accordingly.

Comment

This case study of an actor has brought interesting surprises. Firstly, it has revealed certain similarities between the practitioners of drama in education and actors. Secondly, there seems to be a degree of overlap regarding Shaw’s notion of functions and aims. Thirdly, the theoretical distinctions between types of approach to performance have emerged as fragile. It has not been straightforward to classify Shaw’s performance. Section Two aired theatre theoreticians’ view that most performances are hybrids, drawing upon different approaches and blending them as required in the specific piece.

The case study provided me with a unique opportunity to compare the work of an actor with teacher-in-role. Perhaps most interesting is the data on the skills involved in the activities. The list of acting criteria provided a system for identifying the skills of teacher-in-role and revealed that our actor and teachers were using common skills to perform their roles. While the acting skills were not solely applicable to the actor, similarly the teachers-in-role held no monopoly over the skills identified in Section Two as associated with teacher-in-role. As we saw earlier, very little has been written about the skills

required to use teacher-in-role, and this is perhaps an additional reason that I had not predicted, that teacher-in-role was taken for something so distinctly different from acting. In the light of these common skills, however, it is time to (re)consider.

CONCLUSION: DENOUEMENT

The comparisons between the case studies of teachers-in-role and actor presented at the end of the section on Shaw have highlighted similarities and outlines. Now in a brief conclusion, I move beyond these to further conclusions and the implications of the project.

In drama in education there has been a reluctance to see teacher-in-role as acting behaviour. Although Bolton's *Acting in classroom drama* has consolidated a view of the roles participants play as acting behaviour, the teacher's roles have consistently been distanced from it. Indeed, when I originally discussed my research idea with colleagues in the field, they usually suggested that it would be better to look at the functions of teacher-in-role. This thesis has questioned this orthodoxy.

Initially, by examining the literature in drama in education, I identified a position which revealed this orthodoxy. From here I began to raise questions about the sharp contrasts made between teacher-in-role and acting. What emerges when the literature of the two fields are juxtaposed, is that the images of acting within drama in education are limited. Many forms of theatre are neglected, particularly those forms which are actually closer to drama in education, such as the various participatory forms, and applied theatre contexts which have a particular issue-raising or information-giving purpose. As a result of the narrow concept of theatre, I found an equally limited concept of acting which excluded even the improvisation actor, despite there being considerable overlap with the teacher-in-role. In contrast, I found contemporary theory on acting to be inclusive and open, offering definitions and categories on the understanding that they are temporary.

This contrast seemed odd, particularly when drama in education is a discipline that has more recently sought to justify its practice through aligning itself explicitly with theatre forms. Increasingly, the vocabulary of the field has incorporated more theatrical terminology, while practice is conceptualised through theatrical models. However, despite teacher-in-role being identified with the roles of playwright and director for a long time, the recent reconsiderations have not brought about a move to reconceptualise teacher-in-role as akin to acting. Again, it seems strange that the most likely connection has been omitted. So, introducing a concept of teacher-in-role as a form of acting has been my contribution to the growing re-evaluations within the field.

Examining the literature of both fields first highlighted the difference in approach to definitions. Whereas theatrical theory resisted strict definitions in order to incorporate broad ranging and developing practices, drama in education appeared to assume a consensus around a specific practice which entailed closed and fixed definitions. In order to systemise the theoretical analysis, I selected four areas that emerged through the literature review of drama in education as key to the distinctions between teacher-in-role and acting. I found that within all four areas- context and audience relationships, functions and aims, skills, and approaches- concepts were derived from a narrow perception of theatre and that acting theory presented notions of practice that rendered such definitions and distinctions superfluous and unsustainable.

Having produced a theoretical argument for blurring the distinction between teacher-in-role and acting, I applied it to practice through the case studies. My argument had been established so far only in relation to discourses. I knew it was conceivable that what is done in practice might not be the same as how it is presented through the discourse.

Clearly, therefore, I needed the opportunity to apply the theory to some examples of both teacher-in-role and actor practice. The systematic application of theoretical frameworks facilitated this process and I did indeed, find discrepancy between discourse and practice. However, rather than suggesting that the initial contrast was right, this process confirmed that no sharp distinction could be made.

In order to enable the theoretical analysis of practice, I had to construct systems that would bring teacher-in-role into a theatrical frame of reference. In a general sense this was achieved through the consideration of practice in the light of the theories which explored a range of positions on acting in Section Two. However, it was also achieved, more specifically, through semiotic analysis. Here it was possible to examine the work of teachers and actor through the same analytical lens. The system that enabled the identification of skills (through listing features identified as skills of teacher-in-role and acting) gave the possibility for the actor to be analysed as a teacher-in-role might expect to be analysed, as well as the other way around. The applications found, again, that a tight boundary cannot be drawn between teacher-in-role and acting.

The list below outlining what the research reveals includes some predictable points and some which were not anticipated.

This research reveals

- That the literature of drama in education has not identified teacher-in-role with acting
- That the literature of the field has consistently distanced teacher-in-role from acting

- That most of the literature of the field reiterates a narrow concept of acting that is only relevant to a particular form of traditional western theatre
- That there are many other theatre forms which exhibit much in common with drama in education
- That in the literature teacher-in-role is deemed different from acting because it has a different function
- That roles in both classroom dramas and theatrical roles function similarly
- That many skills evident in Shaw's performance are also evident in the roles played by O'Neill and O'Toole
- That both actor and teachers-in-role communicated similarly
- That there is no consensus concerning how teacher-in-role is played. O'Neill expresses a concern for only one type of role and approach to playing it, whereas O'Toole uses a range of role types and approaches to them
- That the aims and functions for teacher-in-role remain similar and intertwined, whatever the approach to the roles.

This research suggests

- That theorists in the field of drama in education should broaden their concepts of both acting and theatre so that acting for the teacher-in-role can cease to be a taboo, as 'theatre' in classroom drama once was.
- That the function of teacher-in-role is not as innocent as it purports to be and warrants extended research. Aims and functions appear to be tightly entwined. Such research could seek to determine what kinds of values underpin practice. It would be interesting to see if practitioners tend to operate within tight ideological parameters, as has been suggested, for example, by Nicholson (1995).

- That there is potential for using the systemised semiotic analysis constructed here for further research. Further exploration using this method could produce a closer understanding of the semiotic communication at play between teacher-in-role and participants. Signs are not always decoded as intended. A semiotic analysis could lead to deeper understanding of the unintended signs that have altered the intended meaning. It would give teachers who use role a closer understanding of their own practice. The system could provide a useful enrichment to the reflective practitioner approach espoused by Taylor (1996, 2000).
- That teacher-in-role in classroom drama can be more fully understood and deconstructed through the application of theory from the field of performance.
- That there are discrepancies between discourse which drama practitioners espouse and their practice in the classroom.

The significance of the research

There are five areas in which this research might be seen as significant. I shall consider each in turn.

This research has compared the conceptualisations of acting found within theatrical discourses to those within the literature of drama in education. What has emerged as striking is the determination of theorists to avoid making strict definitions and distinctions. Zarrilli's view of the temporary definition enables a fluidity in theorising practice. It enables practice to reshape, develop, and experiment because it does not expect theatre practice to remain static. If change and rebirth are anticipated, then definitions must shift and reshape to accommodate the evolutions. In contrast, within the field of drama in education, definitions of teacher-in-role tend to reflect a static concept

of practice. What is defined and classified is not expected to expand, experiment and grow in unexpected directions. Such concepts make the practice of drama in education appear to be straightjacketed. So, the research has some significance for a conceptual freeing up which may lead to a liberation in practice. The field is alerted to the fact that its practice need not remain static, creating imitations of what has preceded, but as with theatre, it can develop, experiment and grow as the living art it is.

A second significance is allied to the first. Students are influenced by theory. If they are told that teacher-in-role is not acting, their practice may be influenced by that belief. It may be that teachers have been delimiting themselves by this assumption. Perhaps this research might re-orientate this, and legitimise innovative practice, which otherwise might not have been attempted. I do not suggest that students should have actor training. Nor do I suggest that external acting skills should be used excessively, nor that teachers should use as many costumes as O'Toole. Rather I suggest that teachers should understand that they can draw upon the work of actors to find what is appropriate in their drama and in their context. This is what Heathcote seems to have implied when she wrote 'Signs (and portents?)' back in 1982, but somehow, it became lost among the other important aspects of the article.

This research has deconstructed the myth of value neutrality and raised questions about purpose. It is significant for foregrounding our need to be able to defend our value choices and reflect upon how we may be more imprisoned in our value system than we think. This research supports Winston's call (1998, p.85) for a reflexivity, a reflexive awareness of where we position ourselves ideologically and how this impinges on our practice.

A further significance of this research project is its contribution to the new paradigm which seeks to align drama in education with theatre. It has invited a new perspective on the practices of teacher-in-role, giving them the attention that has previously been given to the participants in drama, but not to the teacher-in-role.

Finally, there might be a conceptual significance even though no change in practice is necessary or desired. Theorising the teacher-in-role as acting may enable teachers to acknowledge the value of different aspects of their experience. After I first read a paper about the work at the Ohio International Drama in Education Research Institute (IDIERI 2000) Mary Pratt Cooney sent me an e mail articulating the personal, individual significance of the project that I myself had not then understood:

I remember the moments following your presentation, when people around me in almost hushed whispers, confessed that they had been actors at one point in their careers. There was something quite liberating about the whole thing. Maybe this provided the 'missing link': permission to connect what had first brought us into the world of theatre with process drama work...So, for the past few years I have felt I was straddling two worlds. Theatre: the production and Theatre: the process. Your paper provided reassurance that they might be reconciled after all.' (Pratt Cooney, 2000).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Abercrombie, D. 1968) Paralanguage', *British Journal of Disorders of Communication*, 3, 55-59.
- Ackroyd, J. & Boulton, J. (2001) *Drama Lessons for Five to Eleven-Year-Olds*, London, David Fulton Publishers.
- Ackroyd, J. (1994) 'A Crack in the Ice:Planning for Secure Drama' *Language and Learning*, Nov/Dec edition.
- Ackroyd, J. (1998a) 'The Plant, the Jacket and the Rosary Beads:Objects as Distancing Devices' in O'Sullivan, C. & Williams, G. (Eds) *Bridges. Laying the Foundations for a Child Centred Curriculum in Drama and Education* Birmingham, NATD.
- Ackroyd, J. (1998b) 'Much Ado About Shakespeare' in C. Miller and J.Saxton (ed) *The NADIE Journal: Selected IDIERI papers*, Vol. 22, Number 1.
- Ackroyd, J. & Hughes, J. (2000) *Greek Theatre: Antigone & Medea* St Clair Press, Sydney.
- Ackroyd, J. & Pilkington, A. (1997) 'Towards a non-essentialist Multiculturalism in Drama Education' *NADIE Journal* Volume Number 2.
- Adelman, C. Jenkins,D. & Kemmis, S. (1977) 'Rethinking case study:notes from the second Cambridge conference', *Cambridge Journal of Education*, 6.
- Alcock, B. (1999) 'We Needn't Bring Any Books Tomorrow' in Clark and Tony Goode (ed) *Assessing Drama*, A Gulbenkian Foundation/National Drama Publication.
- Alfreds, M (1980) A Shared Experience: The Actor as Story teller' in *Theatre Papers: The Third Series*. Dartington UK, Dartington College of the Arts, No. 6.
- Andrews, J. (ed) (2001) *Shakespeare's World and Work*, Charles Scribner's Sons, Princeton, New Jersey.

- Archer, W. (1912) *Playmaking. A Manual of Craftsmanship*, Chapman & Hall Ltd. London.
- Aristotle (1981) *Aristotle's Poetics: a translation and commentary for students of literature*, Tallahassee, University Presses of Florida.
- Aston, E. & Savona, G. (1991) *Theatre as a Sign System*, London, Routledge.
- Baker, G. P (1976) *Dramatic Technique* A Da Capo Paperback.
- Ball, S (1990) *Politics and Policy Making in Education*, London, Routledge.
- Ball, S. (2001) 'The Heart of the Matter: placing the arts at the centre of health promotion' in *Research in Drama Education*, Volume 6, Number 2.
- Banham, M (1995) *The Cambridge Guide to Theatre*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Bassey, M. (1999) *Case Study research in Educational Settings*, Buckingham, Open University Press.
- Beckerman, B.
(eds) Beckerman, G.B.
& Coco, C. (1990) *Theatrical Presentation: Performer, Audience and Act*, New York, Routledge.
- Becket, S. (1958) *Endgame*, London, Faber.
- Bell, J. (1999) *Doing Your Research Project*. Third Edition, Buckingham, Open University Press.
- Bennett, S. (1997) *Theatre Audiences*. Second Edition, London, Routledge.
- Bentley, E. (1992) *The Theory of the Modern Stage*, London, Penguin.
- Berger, A.A. (1991)[1933] *Media Analysis Techniques*, Revised edition, London, Sage.
- Bernstein, B (1961) 'Social class and linguistic development: a theory of social learning' in A.H.Halsey, J.Floud, & C.A.Anderson, *Education, Economy, and Society*, New York, The Free Press.
- Berry, C. (1987) *The Actor and his Text*, London, Harrap.

- Best, D. (2001) 'True fiction' in *Drama*, Winter 2001 Volume 9, No.1.
- Biodun, J. (1984) *The Yoruba Popular Travelling Theatre of Nigeria*, Nigeria Magazine.
- Blau, H. (1992) *To All Appearances: Ideology and Performance*, New York, Routledge.
- Boal, A. (1979) *Theatre of the Oppressed*, trans. By Charles A. and Maria-Odilia Leal McBride, London, Pluto.
- Boal, A (1992) *Games for Actors and Non-Actors*, London, Routledge.
- Boal, A. (1995) *The Rainbow of Desire*, trans. By Adrian Jackson, London, Routledge.
- Bolton, G. (1979) *Towards a Theory of Drama in Education*, London, Longman.
- Bolton, G. (1998) *Acting in Classroom Drama: a critical analysis*, Stoke on Trent, Trentham Books.
- Bolton, G.
& Heathcote, D. (1999) *So You Want to use Role-play?* Stoke on Trent, Trentham Books.
- Booth, D. (1994) *Story Drama: Reading, writing and role playing across the curriculum*, Markham, Pembroke Publishers.
- Booth, D. (1995) 'About David Booth' in *Pre-text & Storydrama: The Artistry of Cecily O'Neill & David Booth*, edited by Philip Taylor, NADIE Research Monograph Series, Number One.
- Boso, C. (1980) 'Contre "La mort sucree"', in *Bouffonnaires*, No. 3, May.
- Bowell, P. & Heap, B. (2001) *Planning Process Drama*, London, David Fulton Publishers.
- Brecht, B. (1977) *The Measures Taken and other Lehrstucke* London, Methuen.
- Brecht, B (1986) [1950] 'The Street Scene' in *Brecht on Theatre* translated by John Willet, London, Methuen.

- Brecht, B. (1986) [1957] 'Theatre for pleasure or theatre for instruction' in *Brecht on Theatre*, translated by John Willet, London: Methuen.
- Brecht, B. (1981) [1941] *The Resistable Rise of Arturo Ui*, trans. Ralph Manheim, John Willet & Ralph Manheim (eds), London, Methuen.
- Brennan, J (1992) *Mixing Methods: Qualitative and Quantitative Research*, Aldershot, Avesbury.
- Brook, P. (1990) *The Empty Space*, London, Penguin.
- Bryman, A (1988) *Quantity and quality in social research*, Unwin Hyman, London.
- Burgess, R. G. (ed) (1982) *Field Research: A Source Book and Field Manual*, Allen & Unwin, London.
- Burgess, R. (1982) 'Multiple strategies in fieldwork' in R.C. Burgess (ed) *Field Research: A Sourcebook and field manual*, London, George Allen and Unwin.
- Burke, M. (1995) 'Training the Drama Teacher' in *Canadian Tertiary Drama Education Perspectives on Practice ed Juliana Saxton & Carole Miller*, Victoria, University of Victoria.
- Callow, S. (1985) *Being An Actor*, Harmondsworth, Penguin.
- Callow, S. (2000) Interview, July, Milton Keynes.
- Carey, J. (1990) 'Teaching in Role and Classroom Power' in *Drama Broadsheet*, Summer, Vol. 7.2.
- Carlson, M (1996) *Performance: a critical Introduction*, London, Routledge.
- Catoron, Louis E. (1993) *The Elements of Playwriting*, London, Macmillan.
- Cavendish, D. (2001) "'We need tragedy at the moment'" The Daily Telegraph, 15th January.
- Chaikein, J. (1991) *The Prescence of the Actor* New York: Theatre Comm. Group.
- Chinyowa, K. (2001) 'The Sarangano and Shona Storytelling: and African Theatrical Paradigm' *Studies in Theatre and Performance*, Volume 21, Number 1.

- Clifford, J. (1986) *Writing Culture*, Berkeley, University of California Press.
- Clipson-Boyles, S. (1998) *Drama in Primary English Teaching*, London, David Fulton Publishers.
- Cohen, L & Manion, L. (1994) *Research Methods in Education*, Fourth Edition, London, Routledge.
- Copeau, J. (1990) [1916] *Copeau: texts on theatre*, Edited and translated by John Rudlin & Norman, London, Routledge.
- Cordner, M. (ed) (1982) *The Man of Made* [1676] in *The Plays of George Etherege*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Counsell, C. (1996) *Signs of Performance*, London, Routledge.
- Croall, J. (1999) 'Fiona and Bernard go touring' in *Stagewrite*, Royal National Theatre.
- Culler, J. (1976) *Saussure*, Glasgow, Fontana.
- Davis, D. (1998) *Forward to Gavin Bolton Acting in Classroom Drama*, Stoke on Trent, Trentham Books
- Denzin, N. & Lincoln, Y. (eds) (1994) *Handbook of Qualitative Research*, London, Sage.
- Denzin, N.K. (1991) *Images of Postmodern Society: Social Theory and Contemporary Cinema*, London, Sage.
- Durkheim, E. (1964) [1895] *The Rules of Sociological Method*, the Free Press, New York).
- Easthope, A. & McGowan, K. (1992) *A Critical and Cultural Theory Reader*, Buckingham, Open University Press.
- Edmiston, B & Wilhelm, B. (2000) *Imagining to Learn: inquiry, Ethics and Integration Through Drama*, New York, Heinemann.
- Egri, L. (1950) *The Art of Writing*, London, Pitman.
- Elam, K. (1991) *The Semiotics of Theatre and Drama*, London, Routledge.
- Emilovich, C. (1995) 'Distancing Passion:Narratives in Social Science' in J. Hatch and R. Wisnieski (Eds) *Life History and Narrative*, New York, Falmer.

- Esslin, M. (1974) *The Theatre of the Absurd*, Harmondsworth, Penguin Books.
- Esslin, M. (1978) *The Anatomy of Drama*, London, Abacus.
- Ernest, P. (1994) *Educational Research, Its Philosophy and Purpose: An Introduction to Research Methodology and Paradigms*, Monograph Series, Research Support Unit, School of Education, University of Exeter.
- Esslin, M (1987) *The Field of Drama*, London, Methuen.
- Euripides, (1993) *Medea*, Dover Publications.
- Euripides, (1981) *The Baccae*, in *Ten Plays by Euripides*, translated by Moses Hadas & John McLean, London, Bantam.
- Eyre, R (1999)
cited in Zucker, C. (ed) *In the company of actors: Reflections on the craft of acting*, London, A&C Black.
- Eyre, R. (1999) 'Theatre de Complicite' The Late Show, BBC>
- Fleming, M. (1997) *The Art of Drama Teaching*, London, David Fulton Press.
- Fontana, A. & Frey, J. H. (1994) 'Interviewing: The Art of Science' in N. Denzin & Y. Lincoln (Eds) *Handbook of Qualitative Research*, Fourth Edition, London, Routledge.
- Fortier, M. (1997) *Theory/Theatre an introduction*, London, Routledge.
- Frost, A. & Yarrow, R. (1990) *Improvisation in Drama*, Macmillan.
- Gallagher, K. (2000) *Drama Education in the lives of Girls: Imagining Possibilities*, Toronto, University of Toronto Press.
- Gillham, G. (1974) 'Condercum School Report' for Newcastle upon Tyne LEA (unpublished).
- Goffman, E. (1959) *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life*, London, Penguin.
- Golby, M. (1994) *Case Study as Educational Research*, Monograph Series, Research Support Unit, School of Education, University of Exeter.

- Goodwin, J. (ed) (1983) *Peter Hall's Diaries*, Hamish Hamilton.
- Goorney, H. (1981) *The Theatre Workshop Story*, London, Eyre Methuen.
- Grebenik, E. & Moser, C.A. (1962) 'Society: problems and methods of study' in Welford, A.T., Argyle, M., Glass, O. and Morris, J.N. (eds) *Statistical Surveys*. London, Routledge.
- Grotowski, J. (1968) *Towards a Poor Theatre*, London, Methuen.
- Hall, S. (1992) 'The Question of Cultural Identity' in S.Hall, D.Held, T. McGrew, (eds) *Modernity and its Futures* Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Halliwell, S. (1987) *The Poetics of Aristotle*, Chapel Hill, University of North Carolina Press.
- Hampden, J. (ed) (1975) *The Beggar's Opera and other Eighteenth Century Plays*, Everyman's Library, London.
- Hare, D. (1976) [1947] *Fanshen*, London, Faber.
- Harrop, J. (1992) *Acting*, London, Routledge.
- Hartnoll, P. (1987) *The Theatre*, Thames and Hudson, London.
- Harwood, R. (1984) *All the World's a Stage*, London, Secker & Warbury.
- Hawkes, T. (1977) *Structuralism and Semiotics*, London, Methuen.
- Heathcote, D. (1967) *Drama in Education*, Newcastle, University of Newcastle.
- Heathcote, D. (1970) *Three Looms Waiting*, Omnibus, BBC.
- Heathcote, D. (1982) 'Sign (and portents?)' in SCYPT Journal, No 9.
- Hilton, J. (1987) *Performance*, London, Macmillan.
- Hodge, A. (2000) *Twentieth Century Actor Training*, Routledge, Methuen.
- Hodgson, J. & Richards, E. (1977) *Improvisation*, London, Methuen.

- Holdaway, S. (2000) 'Theory and Method in Qualitative Research' in D. Burton (ed) *Research Training for Social Scientists*, London, Sage.
- Hornbrook, D. (1998) *Education and Dramatic Art 2nd Edition*, Routledge, London.
- Howe, E. (1992) *The First English Actresses: women and drama 1660-1700*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Hayman, R. (1977) *How To Read a Play*, London, Methuen.
- Ibsen, H. (1998) *Rosmersholm*, Oxford Paperbacks.
- Ibsen, H. (1993) *A Doll's House*, in *Plays: Two*, translated by Michael Meyer, London Methuen.
- Inglis, F. (1993) 'The Theatre State and the Idiom of Drama', *Drama and the Making of Meaning*, London, National Drama Publications.
- Izzo, G. (1998) *Acting Interactive Theatre*, Portsmouth, New Hampshire, Heinemann.
- Jackson, P. (2000) 'Race and Racism' in D. Burton (ed) *Research in Training for Social Scientists*, London, Sage.
- Jackson, Tony. (1993) *Learning Through Theatre: new perspectives on theatre in education*, Second Edition, London, Routledge.
- Johnstone, K. (1981) *Impro: Improvisation and the Theatre*, London, Methuen.
- Johnstone, K. (1999) *Impro for Storytellers*, London, Faber & Faber.
- Kellaway, K. (2001) 'The mother of all tragedies' *The Observer Review*, 21st January.
- Kempe, A. (1990) *The GCSE DRAMA Coursebook*, Oxford, Blackwell.
- Kempe, A. (1998) 'Reading Plays for Performance' in David Hornbrook (ed) *On the Subject of Drama*
- Kerr, D. (1995) 'Theatre for Development' in *African Popular Theatre*, London, Heinemann.

- Kirby, M. (1996) 'On Acting and Non-Acting', in Zarilli, P. (ed) *Acting (Re)Considered*, London, Routledge.
- Kitson, N. & Spiby, I. (1997) *Drama 7-11: developing primary teaching skills*, London, Routledge.
- Kitson, N. & Spiby, I. (1995) *Primary Drama Handbook*, London, Watts Books.
- Lawrence, C. (1982) 'Teacher and Role', *2D*, Vol. 1. No. 2.
- Lewicki, T. (1996) *From 'Play way' to 'Dramatic Art'*, Rome, LAS.
- Lyotard, J.F. (1984) *The Postmodern Condition: A report on Knowledge*, (1979) trans. Geoff Bennington and Brian Massumi. Manchester, Manchester University Press.
- MacIntyre, A. (1981) *After Virtue*, London, Duckworth.
- Mamet, D (1997) *True and False: Heresay and Common Sense for the Actor*, London, Faber & Faber.
- McBurney, S. (1999) 'Theatre de Complicite', The Late Show, BBC.
- Mead, G. H. (1934) *Mind, Self and Society*, Chicago, University of Chicago Press.
- Miller, J. (1972) 'Plays and Players' in Hinde (1972)
- Morgan, G. (ed) (1983) *Beyond Method*, London, Verso.
- Morgan, N. & Saxton, J. (1987) *Teaching Drama: a mind of many wonders*, Cheltenham, Hutchinson Educational.
- Neelands, J. (1984) *Making Sense of Drama*, London, Heinemann.
- Neelands, J. (1990) *Structuring Drama Work*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Neelands, J. (1993) *Writing in Imagined Contexts*, Toronto, Research Services Toronto Board of Education.
- Neelands, J. & Goode, T. (1995) 'Playing in the Margins of Meaning: Ritual Aesthetics in Drama', *The NADIE Journal*, Volume 20, Number 1.
- Neelands, J. (1998a) *Beginning Drama 11-14*, London, David Fulton Publishers.
- Neelands, J. (1998b) Unpublished PhD thesis, Warwick University.

- Neelands, J. (1998c) 'Three Theatres Waiting:Archetectural Spaces and Performance Traditions' in C. Miller and J.Saxton (ed) *The NADIE Journal: Selected IDIERI papers*, Vol. 22, Number 1.
- Neelands, J. (2000a) 'In the hands of living people'in *Drama Research* Number 1.
- Neelands, J. & Dobson, W. (2000b) *Theatre Directions*, London, Hodder & Stoughton.
- Nicholson, H. (1994) 'Drama and the Arts:from polemic to practice. Celebrating ourselves as Experts' in *Drama*, Volume 3, No. 1.
- Nicholson, H. (1995) *NADIE journal*, Vol. 19, No. 2
- Nisbet, J. D. & Watt, J. (1980) *Case Study*. Rediguide 26, University of Nottingham, School of Education.
- O'Connor, P. (2000) Book Review, Australia Drama NADIE journal, Vol. 24, No. 1
- O'Hanlon, C. (1993) 'The importance of an articulated theory of professional development' in J. Elliott (ed) *Reconstructing Teacher Education: Teacher Development*, Falmer, London.
- O'Neill, C. (1995) *Drama Worlds: a framework for process drama*, Portsmouth, New Hampshire, Heinemann.
- O'Neill, C. (1995) 'Pre-text:The Artistry of Cecily O'Neill' in Philip Taylor (ed) *Pre-text & Storydrama: The Artistry of Cecily O'Neill & David Booth*, Brisbane, n.a.d.i.e.
- O'Neill, C. & Lambert, A. & Linnell, R. & Warr-Watd, J. (1976) *Drama Guidelines*, Heinemann, London.
- O'Neill, C. & Lambert, A. (1982) *Drama Structures:A Practical Handbook for Teachers*, Hutchinson, London.
- O'Neill, C. (ed) (1984) *Dorothy Heathcote: Collected Writings on Education and Drama*, London, Hutchinson.
- O'Neill, C. (1996) 'Into the Labyrinth:Theory and Research in Drama' in P. Taylor (ed) *Researching Drama and The Arts*

- Education: Paradigms and Possibilities*, Falmer Press, London.
- O'Neill, C. (2000) Lesson taught for Youth Theatre, Royal National Theatre, London.
- O'Toole, J. & Haseman, B. (1988) *Dramawise -An Introduction to GCSE Drama*, Heinemann, London.
- O'Toole, J. (1977) *Theatre in Education*, London, Hodder and Stoughton.
- O'Toole, J. (1992) *The Process of Drama (Negotiating Art and Meaning)* London, Routledge.
- O'Toole, J. (1996) 'Art in Scholarship and Scholarship in Art: Towards a Poetics of Drama Research' in P.Taylor (ed) *Researching Drama and The Arts Education: Paradigms and Possibilities*, London, Falmer Press.
- O'Toole, J. (2001) *Pilgrims' Progress*, Paper delivered at IDEA World Conference of Drama/Theatre and Education, Bergen, Norway.
- Oddey, A. (1999) *Performing Women: Stand-Ups, Strumpets and Itinerants*, London, Macmillan Press Ltd.
- Okpewho, I. (ed) (1990) *The Oral Performance in Africa*, Ibadan, Spectrum Books.
- Oida, Y. (with Lorna Marshall) (1992) *An Actor Adrift*, London, Methuen.
- Osofisan, F. (1991) *Once Upon Four Robbers*, Ibadan, Heinemann Educational Books Nigeria PLC.
- Parkes, M. (1992) 'The Art of Pedagogy: Artistic Behaviour as a Model for Teaching', *Art Education*, Vol. 45, No.5.
- Parks, K. (1995) "You've been in a play, you teach the drama class:" The need for a Standardised System for the Hiring of School Drama Teachers' in Juliana Saxton & Carole Miller (eds), *Canadian Tertiary Drama Education Perspectives on Practice*, Victoria, University of Victoria.
- Pavis, P. (1985) 'Theatre Analysis: Some Questions and a Questionnaire' *New Theatre Quarterly*, 1(2).

- Pears, D. (1971) *Wittgenstein*, London, Fontana.
- Pilkington, A. et al. (1997) *Sociology in Focus*, Ormskirk, Causeway Press.
- Pinter, H. (1991) *The Caretaker*, Faber Paperbacks.
- Polanyi, M. (1958) *Personal Knowledge: towards a post-critical philosophy*, London, Routledge & K. Paul.
- Poster, M. (ed) (1988) *Jean Baudrillard: Selected Writings*, Cambridge, Polity.
- Pratt Cooney, M. (1997) 'Lehrstucke and Process Drama', *Drama Matters*, Vol.2, No.1. pp41-52.
- Propp, V. (1968) [1928] *Morphology of the Folktale*, trans. And revised edition, Austin and London, University of Texas Press.
- Rasmussen, B. (1996) 'The Philosophy of Research in Drama' in *Research in Drama Education*, Vol. 1. No. 1.
- Rasmussen, B. (1999) Book review in *Research in Drama in Education*, Vol. 4. No.2.
- Richardson, H (1994) 'Genre, Gender and Play: Feminist Theory and Drama Education' in *NADIE Journal*, Vol.19, No2.
- Richardson, V. (1994) 'Problems and Possibilities of institutionalising teacher research' in (ed) Sandra Hollingsworth *Teacher Research and Educational Reform*, Chicago, The National Society for the Study of Education.
- Ritchie, R. (1987) *The Joint Stock Book: The Making of a Theatre Collective*, London, Methuen.
- Robinson, K. (ed) (1980) *Exploring Theatre and Education*, London, Heinemann.
- Robson, C. (1993) *Real World Research : A Resource of Social Scientists and Practitioner-Researchers*, Oxford, Blackwell.
- Romain, M. (1992) *A profile of Jonathan Miller*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Rothenberg, J. (1977) 'New Models, New Visions: Some Notes Toward a Poetics of Performance', in Michael Benamou and

- Charles Caramello (eds) *Performance in Postmodern Culture*, Madison: Coda Press Inc.
- Rudlin, J. (1994) *Commedea dell'arte: An Actor's Handbook*, London, Routledge.
- Saussure, F. (1966) *Course in General Linguistics*, trans. Wade Baskin, New York, McGraw-Hill Paperbacks.
- Savage, L. (2000) *Christian Street Theatre*, Unpublished undergraduate dissertation, University College Northampton.
- Schechner, R. (1988) *Performance Theory*, London, Routledge.
- Schechner, R. (1996) 'Worlds of Performance' editorial introduction to Part One in P. Zarrilli (ed) *Acting (Re)Considered. Theories and Practices*, London, Routledge.
- Schon, D. (1987) *Educating the Reflective Practitioner*, Viking, New York.
- Schutzman, M. & Cohen-Cruz, J. (eds) (1994) *Playing Boal: theatre, therapy, activism*, London, Routledge.
- Selden, R. & Widdowson, P (1993) *Contemporary Literary Theory*, London, Harvester Wheatsheaf.
- Selltiz, D., Jahoda, M., Deutsch, M., & Cook, S.W. (1962) *Research Methods in Social Relations*, 2nd edition, New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
- Sennett, R. (1977) *The Fall of Public Man*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Shakespeare, W. (1994) *Romeo and Juliet*, London, Penguin Popular Classics.
- Shakespeare, W (1998) *Hamlet*, Oxford, Oxford Paperbacks.
- Shakespeare, W. (1994) *Romeo and Juliet*, London, Penguin Popular Classics.
- Shakespeare, W. (1998) *King Lear*, London, Thomas Nelson
- Shaw, F. (1999)

- cited in C. Zucker, *In the company of actors: Reflections on the craft of acting*, London, A&C Black.
- Shaw, F. (2001) 'Best of Times: Worst of Times' The Sunday Times magazine.
- Shaw, G.B. (1957) *The Quintessence of Ibsenism*, New York, Hill and Wang.
- Sikes, P. (1997) *Parents Who Teach: Stories from Home and from School*, London, Cassells.
- Slade, P. (1958) *An Introduction to Child Drama*, London, University of London Press.
- Smallwood, R. (ed) (1988) *Players of Shakespeare*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Smurthwaite, N. (2000) 'Hell Hath No Fury' Stratford, RSC book.
- Sophocles, (1958) *The Oedipus Plays of Sophocles*, translated by Paul Roche, New York, A Mentor Classic.
- States, B.O. (1996) 'The Actor's Presence', in *Acting (Re)Considered* edited by Phillip Zarrilli, London, Routledge.
- Strindberg, A. (1991) *Plays One, Strindberg*, London, Methuen.
- Styan, J.L. (1975) *Drama, Stage and Audience*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Taylor, P. (1996) 'Rebellion, Reflective Turning and Arts Education Research' in P. Taylor (ed) *Researching Drama and The Arts Education: Paradigms and Possibilities*, London, Falmer Press.
- Taylor, P (1996) *Researching Drama and The Arts Education: Paradigms and Possibilities*, London, Falmer Press.
- Taylor, P. (2000) *The Drama Classroom: Action, Reflection, Transformation*, London, Routledge Falmer.
- Toye, N. & Prendiville, N. (2000) *Drama and traditional story for the early years*, London, RoutledgeFalmer.
- Tufnell, M & Crickmay, C (1993) *Body, Space, Image: Notes Towards Improvisation and Performance*, London, Dance Books.

- Ubersfeld, A. (1978) *Lire le theatre*, Paris, Editions Sociales.
- Vanbrugh, J. (1970)[1696] *The Relapse*, edited by Curt A. Zimansky, London, Edward Arnold.
- Vattimo, G. (1988) *The End of Modernity: Nihilism and Hermeneutics in Post-modern Culture*, Baltimore, John Hopkins University Press.
- Veltrusky, J. (1964[1940]) (trans.) 'Man and Object in the Theatre' in Garvin, P.L. *A Prague School Reader on Aesthetics, Literary Structure, and Style*, Washington, Georgetown University Press. (1964)
- Verma, G. K.
& Beard, R. M. (1981) *What is Educational Research? Perspectives on Techniques of Research*, Aldershot, Gower.
- Vovolis, T. (1996) cited in 'The sound boxes of Aeschylus', Independent on Sunday, May 12th.
- Wagner, B.J. (ed) (1998) *Educational Drama and Language Arts: what research shows*, Portsmouth, New Hampshire, Heineman .
- Walford, G. (ed) (1991) *Doing Educational Research*, London , Routledge.
- Wallace, J. (2000) 'A new stage in Greek Tragedy', The Times Higher Education Supplement, January 18th.
- Watson, I. (1995) "'Reading" the actor: performance, presence, and the synesthetic' *New Theatre Quarterly*, No. 42. Vol. xi. May.
- Warren, B. (1995) *Creating a Theatre in Your Classroom*. North York, Ontario, Captus University Press.
- Way, B (1967) *Developments through Drama*, Harlow, Longman.
- Webster, J. (1997) *The Duchess of Malfi*, Manchester, Manchester University Press.
- Whatman, J. (1998) 'Educating Secondary Student Teachers Through Drama Education' in *NADIE journal*, Selected IDIERI papers, Volume 22, Number 1.
- Wickham, G. (1967) The Ferens Lecture, The University of Hull.
- Williams, P. &
Chrisman, L.(ed) (1993) *Colonial Discourse and Post-Colonial Theory: A Reader*, Hemel Hempstead, Harvester Wheatsheaf.

- Williams, T. (1977) *The Glass Menagerie*, Harmondsworth, Penguin Books.
- Willis, E. & D'Arienzo, C. (1981) *Writing Scripts for Television and Radio*, Holt, Rhinehart and Winston.
- Wiltshire, B. (1991) *Role Playing and Identity: The limits of Theatre as Metaphor* Bloomington and Indianapolis, Indiana University Press.
- Winston, J. (1998) *Drama, Narrative and Moral Education*, Falmer Press, London.
- Winston, J. (1998) *Beginning Drama 4-11*, London, David Fulton Publishers.
- Wiseman, J.P. & Aron, M.S. (1972) *Field Reports in Sociology*, London, Transworld Publishers.
- Wollheim, R. (1971) *Freud*, London, Fontana.
- Wycherley, (1998) *The Country Wife and Other Plays* Oxford Paperbacks.
- Yin, R. K. (1986) *Case Study Research: Design and Method*. London, Sage Publications.
- Zarilli, P (ed) (1996) *Acting (Re)Considered. Theories and Practices*, London, Routledge.
- Zucker, C (1999) *In the company of actors : Reflections on the craft of acting*, London, A&C Black.
- The Independent on Sunday, (1999) 'Bard stupid?' Transcript of discussion on BBC Radio 4.

Performances

Goosebumps, (1999), Peepolikus, Roadmender, Northampton.

The Mystery of Charles Dickens (2000), Milton Keynes Theatre.

Medea, (2000), The Abbey Theatre, Dublin & Queens Theatre, London.

King Lear, (1997) (with Kathryn Hunter), The Young Vic Theatre, London.

The Lady in the Van, (2000) (with Maggie Smith) Queen's Theatre, London.

Hedda (1975) (with Glenda Jackson) Brut Productions, Hollywood Nites.

Hedda Gabler (1993) (with Fiona Shaw) BBC.

APPENDICES

Appendix 1
Romans in Britain(Marcus)

Appendix 2
Callow's interview

Appendix 3
Initial research questions

Appendix 4
Gavin Bolton's letter

Appendix 5
Suzie and the Snow

Appendix 6
O'Neill's e mail

Appendix 7
O'Toole's e mails

Appendices 8
Tapes of interview transcripts

Appendix 1

Romans in Britain

This drama (Ackroyd & Bolton, 2001, p.84) was designed to support history teaching with 8 – 11 year olds. The children in role as time travellers discover details of the Roman attack on Anglesey in AD 60. The all-powerful ‘Great Mistress of Time’ has a mission for the new team of time travellers. They must go into the past and report on what they discover. They meet people from the past (such as Marcus, the young Roman soldier) and get involved with events, learning about the Roman occupation and the Britons’ various responses to it. The children move between roles in the past and their time travelling roles in the present. They address the situation from the point of view of the Romans, and of the Britons, as well as of observers in the present.

Appendix 2

Interview with Simon Callow

Relevant highlights

This interview took place in Callow's dressing room. The transcript is vague in places because Callow was eating his lunch from paper bags and the crumpling of paper distorted the voices.

My voice is in italics.

Re. Dickens reading aloud, I noticed from what you said, you saw yourself as acting and was excited because this was what you'd always wanted to do - be an actor and suddenly you were acting. He was reading aloud and he had a script that he chose not to look at it. Would you say that was acting as opposed to reading aloud?

He wasn't actually reading at all. Because what he did basically was swallow the narrative and then he reproduces, but he dramatised it all.

So dramatised form, you mean using gesture...

... characterisation, creating, emphasising within the narrative craft. Acting can be many things beyond just plain character and I would say that telling his story is very much part of it. And to tell a story in such a way that you're definitely hyping it as opposed to simply giving a raw report then I think act

I work with a couple of Nigerians who talk of the mode of working for the African storyteller is acting.

Dickens went particularly far as a storyteller in that he really did generate character. Many storytellers stand back from that, stretching the characters very very lightly. Dickens went the whole hog. Dickens had been an actor and had a great deal of experience as an actor.

Do you think that you were doing the same thing as Dickens?

Is that story telling? Story telling like Dickens? I am alluding to somebody that existed and informing the audience. Dickens only ever dealt with fiction. You may say that Dickens as a man is in the play, to some extent fictionalised. But basically no, I wouldn't say that. What I did on television reproduced his public readings

You moved between being the narrator and being Dickens and being Dickens' fictional characters.

It's very complex. The it got increasing complex because sometimes I become Dickens. Sometimes I show you what his mental processes were without actually being Dickens. By speaking in the third person I sometimes produce a first person kind of emotion on that. It is quite unusual.

Those three things, narrating, Dickens and Dickens' characters, do they necessitate or demand different things from the performer?

Characters obviously require a kind of degree of willingness to transform to transform vocally and the whole pitch of the character. Many actors don't have to do that. Hugh grant, for example doesn't transform in this way because he doesn't like to go very far from what he is normally doing it or wanting to.

But becoming Dickens, what happens I think as the evening goes on is that Dickens and I merge, increasingly merge so that I think, I hope, the impression that you have, whereas at the being I am quoting Dickens but I get him in a particular tone of voice, by the end of that you can actually become Dickens. I don't need to be ushered into Dickens' voice. Because it's like placing several shards of a mosaic, by the end it's all one.

I am conscious of your time so I am going to push on – we talked about transformation.

There's a quotation – I'll read it to you and it says – this is for teaching drama – you don't have to be act to be acting – just being yourself telling something from someone else's perspective – representing an attitude or point of view. Might that describe what you're talking about in _____ ?

Mm

It's someone else's perspective and representing an attitude or situation social context?

Yes, that's true enough

But, presumably you were doing

Exactly – its impossible to imagine

This show is to

-

And is that what your doing in Three Sisters? You're thinking of social

Appendix 3

Initial research questions

Questions first listed over three days to consider what I wanted to understand through the thesis, prior to beginning the research. July, 1998, Montreal.

What is the distinction between the two?

What are the commonalities between working in role and actor in role?

There are different functions of character in theatre – do we utilise the same in role?

Actors use different approaches for different plays – do we in role?

Some roles actors take are not ‘characters’. Is there a distinction between role and character?

Is the teacher representing role, becoming role, or indicating role?

What are the functions of TIR and actor in role (as opposed to character and role)?

How differently can both be carried out?

What is the relationship to the audience for the actor and teacher-in-role?

What are the expectations of the audience for both?

What focuses mental attention for the actor and TIR?

What does the teacher and actor wish to achieve?

What is the art perceived as for the actor in his work and for the teacher?

Is there a difference in terms of emotional engagement between the two?

What is the actor doing given the various types of performance?

Is it what we do in role?

What is the relationship between the actor and the role being played?

Do they need to identify with it or are they detached?

Does the teacher need a particular relationship with the role played?

What are the complexities of both teacher-in-role and acting?

Are the ways actors and teachers view their roles diverse?

Would actors describe and perceive role and acting differently from teachers?

Is it possible to identify a consensus of what actors believe they are doing in role?

And the teachers?

Is there enough of a consensus to compare?

Appendix 4

Gavin Bolton's letter

Letter from Gavin Bolton

19.06.01

Dear Judith

I think you are right that no one appear to have gone thoroughly into TIR. Most of us have talked about its 'functions' but rarely go into its component skills. I certainly recognise the teacher trainer's tendency to mislead by reassuring students that acting isn't required. I don't know why I would be 'quietly unimpressed' by your suggestion that TIR was also 'acting'. I wonder if I misunderstood you and thought you were stating the obvious? Which, in a way, you were, but I can see it needs stating and loudly.

I think the biggest 'lie' has always come from the one who invented the strategy, Dorothy Heathcote. She would claim that 'it's not about acting' and then give a *tour de force* performance! I think nowadays her approach would seem nearer to what you call Cecily's 'minimalist' acting, but in the early days, powerful provocation was part of the teacher's luggage [I nearly said 'weaponry'!]. Certainly her 3-year professional theatre training provided a basis for her TIR techniques – she is a very good actress. I was astonished, however, [as was she – I phoned her] at your quote from Pratt Cooney who has got it all wrong. Dorothy was never an artist in residence nor has she ever been employed professionally as an actress. Nevertheless a feature of her TIR involves acting in its broad sense. [I still cling to my notion of a 'narrow' sense in which the skill in performance is part of the overall meaning and pleasure accruing for the audience – as in conventional stage acting and in, say, the final presentation of a piece of work in the drama classroom following which it would be appropriate to applaud or offer silent admiration. This tacit invitation from the actor for approval from an audience is surely one residually part of TIR – I once had an embarrassing experience – coincidentally, in Cork – in which before an audience of teachers I addressed them in role thinking I was successfully 'drawing them in' to 'our play' and they clapped!!!].

If the dimension of 'inviting approval of acting skill' can be seen as a layer of acting behaviour that is virtually absent from TIR, I support that at the other end of the scale 'inviting to co-operate in making fiction together' is not evidence in performance [one step up, of course, 'inviting audience to share in *attending* to the fiction' is critical]. My work with Victim Support is an example of the former. I invite the young child of the house where there has been a burglary to 'make the burglary story', to give the chief burglar a name and then I take on the role of the 'stupid assistant' and we 'make' [act] the, often comic, story. We don't 'talk' it through; we act it, carrying out the burglary, but not using the 'real' house – for instance, I, in my role as stupid and lazy, will say, 'These stairs are a climb and I bet we don't find anything worth taking...' – and I mime climbing imaginary stairs in some corner of the living room, firmly establishing the fictitious nature of what we are doing. No child yet has insisted on climbing the 'real' stairs.

Now this is an invitation to act (TIR) at its most modest. It's almost like a parent humming a tune and inviting a child to join in or picking up a pebble and inviting a child to 'throw into the sea'. So, 'let's hum, throw pebbles and act a fiction' are instances of a grown up leading a child into an identifiable mode of behaviour. We call the third one TIR.

A feature that is central to these three examples including TIR's acting that I am sure you are aware of is BONDING. After throwing pebbles the child will feel even better if the adult's leadership was at some point taken over by the child who invented some novel way of throwing. Now there is obviously a lot justifiably claimed about 'sharing an event' in conventional theatre performance but those actors who may work hard to adapt to an audience do not see themselves as inviting the audience to be creative. There is not a parallel sense of 'WEness'. I suppose this kind of element in TIR, not unlike what any 'good' parent could do, may have led to practitioners claiming that 'you don't have to act.'

A key strand of TIR is the breaking down of the normal teacher/student relationship into a 'we' relationship. Thus it is possible that if Cecily had been insufficient. DH's efforts in this direction often resorted to thickening her accent, using slang even swearing (mildly!). In America her voice would often become Americanised. We used to assume this was aimed at authenticity within the fiction but I now believe it much more served 'bonding as a preparation for creativity'.

Common to both TIR and straight acting is, as you say, the need to communicate a range of facts, moods, context, sense of period and tension as economically as possible all of which required acting skills, not just those of a dramatist or director.

I'm not sure that I know the origins of the distinction between 'role' and 'acting'. At the back of my mind is what may amount to no more than an old wives' tale that the actor's script used to be written on a *roll* pf papyrus.

Which brings me to the one bit of your paper that I found myself lost with. It seems to me that *suddenly* the term 'representation' occurs without explanation. You then go on using it a though its meaning and normal context is to be 'understood'. Am I missing something here? Could it be that because this is a heavily edited article from a longer piece of writing that its normal usage is explained in the original?

I don't agree with Mamet that 'there is no character'. I do not believe either that an actor *becomes* a character, but I would claim that a character objectively exists. You *made* a Masha; I *made* a stupid burglar. Both existed to be referred to and analysed.

Good luck with your thesis. It will be just what's needed.

Gavin.

Appendix 5

Suzie and the Snow

This drama (Ackroyd & Bolton, 2001, p19) for 5-8 year olds introduces Suzie, who is sad and wont go out and play in the snow. The children try to find out why and gradually learn about Suzie's accident on the ice the previous year. The past is brought to life with the children all taking part in it. Finally, they advice her about how she can overcome her fears and play in the snow safely.

Appendix 6

O'Neill's e mail

I'll try to answer your questions:

1. How did I get into TIR?

It was seeing Dorothy and then Gavin use the technique in the 'seventies. I tried to emulate Dorothy, but became too controlling, and the kids often got rid of me. When I saw Gavin work, I thought a lower-key approach might suit my teaching style and capacities better. So I used what was really a kind of 'bureaucratic' style -- the second in command, the kind of person it's not worth opposing. So my answer is also the answer to your second question.

Dorothy inspired me of course, particularly her brilliant use of questioning and her gift for achieving dept of thinking and engagement. Before her I'd been thrilled to work with Keith Johnstone and Veronica Sherborne. All of them, it seemed to me, were authentic teachers, who struggled to engage their students in 'real' encounters and experiences. Johnstone's work with improvisation, storytelling and masks was far removed at that time from the 'Theatre Sports' approach. There was a physical reality about the way Sherborne worked in movement that was very convincing.

Gavin remains my greatest influence. I did my MA with him, but his grasp of form within process and his use of significant content produced many 'AHA!' moments, as I realised what drama could be. His modesty and integrity have also been a guide to me, as has his intellectual rigour and his willingness to change his mind as his work develops.

My greatest contribution?

Drama Structures has undoubtedly been very influential, and spawned many imitators. Our purpose in writing it was to make the kind of drama that Gavin and Dorothy espoused actually accessible to teachers. We felt we were interpreters of their approach.

I feel I may have contributed to an understanding of the structure of Process Drama, as well as popularising the term. My aim was to convey how an open, episodic dramatic and largely improvised structure can generate a dramatic event where the episodes function as "a series of segmentations each possessing a sufficient demonstrative power," as Barthes puts it. It will be scholars like yourself and other practitioners who will know whether I've succeeded.

Appendix 7

O'Toole's e mail

Now, the questions you wanted answers to:

>

- > 1. and 2. I first came upon teacher-in-role when I enrolled on Gavin's
- > course in Durham (1968), and watched him and Dorothy using it. I was blown
- > away by its possibilities, and tried to implement it immediately in my own
- > English classes, with disastrous effects, and it all took me a couple
- > of years to change my pedagogy appropriately. I did get some very useful
- > practice in basically the same mode in the TIE team that David Griffiths,
- > Davis Dossor, myself and a few other of Gavin's students set up after we'd
- > had an equally inspiring visit to Bolton Octagon (Roger Chapman, at that
- > point, the Director). That was very helpful, and our TIE team lasted for
- > about six years, mostly part-time, working all the time in low-key
- > fully-integrated participation. Maybe that is what gave me my continuing
- > respect for the theatricality in using teacher-in-role. The relationship
- > between the two words in the phrase 'actor-teacher' was one of the most
- > interesting features to me when I studied TIE to write that first book
- > (Theatre in Education, 1977, Hodder & Stoughton), and during the next few
- > years I compared people as diverse as Brendan Healey {TyneWear TIE} -
- > actor
- > to his bootstraps and a fine instinctive but very undisciplined teacher -
- > with John Surman, no actor, but a brilliant and very shrewd, controlled
- > teacher who was able to bring just enough theatricality to his use of
- > role.
- > The kids rolled over for both of them. [Both are available on film if you
- > can be bothered - Brendan on Labour for the Lord, VHS video, Tynewear TIE
- > 1980; John on Spacemen have Landed in Leeds 1974 16mm film, Leeds TIE.
- > However, from 1976 I worked with primary teachers here in Oz coming out of
- > a very authoritarian and transmissive pedagogical background, who were
- > terrified of drama and its baggage of extroversion. My teaching drama to
- > these kids was a kind of rehab. and I was careful to stress that
- > teacher-in-role did not have to be showy, nor did you have to be an actor.
- > Horses for courses, of course, but looking back, and reading my notes of
- > the time, I think I undersold the theatre and acting implicit in the mode.
- > The rehab seemed to work, as many of them took kindly to drama, but,
- > truthfully, twenty years on, very few primary teachers ACTUALLY use either
- > drama or teacher-in-role in their teaching.
- >
- > Other influences on my use of teacher-in-role? Almost everyone I watch -
- > and that includes a lot of students using it - mostly I'm critical of
- > course, but always ready to learn and have had some great surprises. It's
- > great to watch a real expert doing their stuff: I've watched Cecily and
- > David myself with great interest, and in those early days it was really
- > fascinating to watch and contrast Dorothy (so big and theatrical, yet
- > beautifully anchored and down-to-earth, and Gavin (so absolutely minimal,
- > but the kids were just as focussed and rapt).

>

- > Mainly of interest to me (and I don't have any glib answers) is the way
- > some people can just get students eating out of the palm of their hands, no matter how rough-and-ready their TIR technique. I think charm is a very
- > important tool for both the actor and the teacher (and thus, doubly, for
- > the teacher-in-role).

Question 3: What would you say has been your main contribution to the field of drama education?

I'm one of the mappers, advocates and collaborative consolidators, I think. In their own way both *Dramawise* (with Brad, very important), and *The Process of Drama* maybe have helped to define and clarify the terminology, the concepts and the territory. A rhetoric quickly builds up (or opposing rhetorics, in the case of UK 1980s onwards) and what I tried to do was dismantle the false dichotomies constructed out of these rhetorics that were drowning both the work itself, and the valid criticism of it. I did this by trying to analyse and conceptualise from my own and my colleagues' practice what we actually do - and most importantly, what the word "process" actually means, what the elements of drama are, and how dramatic art form intersects or interacts with learning - what the animal is that we are bickering about. Even though I didn't have much success with UK, at least at the time, I think that I did majority stop the "great [false] debates" from stuffing up Australian Drama education. I am actually very proud of the development of drama in education in Australia, in which I have certainly played a part, in pushing and wheedling, in laying the ground intellectually and practically, and in sustaining a collaborative ethos that has allowed us all to continually move forward in the face of odds at least as great, and in some ways greater, than UK has faced. I've been privileged to work with nearly all the most talented, even brilliant Australian drama educators (rather than against fifty per cent of them).

Appendix 8

Tapes of Case Study Interviews

Most of the interviews have been included in the case studies so I have not included them in the appendices. However, the tapes are provided as Appendix 8.